

1           SOUTHCENTRAL  
2           FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL  
3           ADVISORY COUNCIL

4           Taken at:  
5           Hawthorn Suites Hotel  
6           Anchorage, Alaska

7           October 2, 2001

8   ATTENDANCE

9   Council Members Present:

10   Ralph Lohse, Chair  
11   Fred Elvsass  
12   Roy S. Ewan  
13   Fred John  
14   Clare Swan

15   Coordinator:

16   Ann Wilkinson

17   Others Present:

18   Tom Boyd, US FWS; Tim Jennings, US FWS; Carl  
19   Jack, BIA/US FWS; Pat Petrivelli, US FWS;  
20   Bill Knauer, US FWS; Richard Uberuaga, US  
21   FWS; Pete Probasco, US FWS; Ida Hildebrand,  
22   BIA; Helga Eakon, OSM; Michelle Chivers,  
23   OSM; Eric Veach, Wrangell-St. Elias National  
24   Park; Larry Buklis, OSM; Ken Holbrook,  
25   Chugach National Forest; Lonita M. Lohse,  
26   Chitina Native Corporation; Dave Nelson,  
27   NPS; Sandy Rabinowitch, NPS; Charles  
28   Swanton, ADF&G; Larry Boyle, ADF&G; Janet  
29   Cohen, NPS; Devi Sharp, NPS; Mason Reid,  
30   NPS; Chris Dippel, US FWS; Connie Friend,  
31   Tetlin NWR; Arvid Hogstrom, WRST; Gloria  
32   Stickwan, CRNA; Betty Goodlatow, Tazlina;  
33   Sue Aspelund, CDFU; Molly McCormick,  
34   Wrangell-St. Elias National Park; Sandy  
35   Scotton, NPS; Rob Spangler, USFS; Lin  
36   Perry-Plake, ADF&G; Jane Nicholas, Cantwell;  
37   Bruce Cain, Native Village of Eyak; Michael  
38   Link, LGL; Dan LaPlant, OSM; Jim Hall, Kenai  
39   NWR; Doug McBride, OSM; Ray Neeley, Ahtna;  
40   Milo Burcham, USFS; Bob Gerhard, NPS; Mary

1     McBurney, NPS; Rod Simmons, FWS; Sherry  
2     Wright, ADF&G; Wilson Justin, Mt. Sanford  
3     Tribal Consortium; Joseph Hart, Ahtna; Gary  
4     Sonnevil, US FWS; Sabrina Fernandez,  
5     Attorney General's Office; Barry Mayala,  
6     USDA; Martin Myers, USFS; Thomas Hicks,  
7     Chistochina; Greg Bos, FWS; Linda Tyone,  
8     CRNA; Virginia Gene, CRNA; Donald Mike, OSM;  
9     Judy Gottlieb, NPS; Tim Joyce, USFS; Bob  
10    Hench, Eyak; Ken Thompson, USFS; Taylor  
11    Brelsford, BLM; Bill Simeone, ADF&G; Richard  
12    Davis, OSM; Robert Lohse, Lower Tonsina;  
13    Gary Stervig, Chickaloon Village; Jeffrey  
14    Bryden, USFS; Jeff Denton, BLM; Hollis  
15    Twitchell, Denali National Park; Steve  
16    Klein, FWS; Jessica Cochran, APRN; Jeff  
17    Denton, BLM; Matt Evenson, ADF&G; Jerry  
18    Berg, US FWS; Patty Brown-Schwalenberg,  
19    Chugach Regional Resources Commission; Pete  
20    DiMatteo, US FWS; Delice Calcote, Cook Inlet  
21    Marine Mammal Council; Beth Haley, LGL; Fred  
22    Bahr; Charlie Edwardsen.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. LOHSE: Did everybody sign in  
this morning?

3 I'd like to call this meeting of  
the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council  
4 back in session.

5 MR. JENNINGS: Microphone,  
Mr. Chair.

6  
7 MR. LOHSE: I'd like to call the  
meeting of the Southcentral Regional  
Advisory Subsistence Council back in  
8 session.

9 We going to start with Proposal  
20. We'll have an introduction by Larry.

10 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr.  
Chairman. Larry Buklis, Office of  
11 Subsistence Management. I'll be covering  
staff analysis for Proposal No. 20. That  
12 can be found in your council book, on page  
133.

13 This proposal for the Batzulnetas  
Fishery in the Upper Copper River was  
14 submitted by the Subsistence Fishery for the  
Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and  
15 Preserve. The preserve requests households  
with a permit to fish in the Batzulnetas  
16 Fishery, to also have an additional Federal  
permit to fish in the Upper Copper River  
17 District. An NPS Subsistence Fishery permit  
issued by the Parks Service is required to  
18 take salmon in the Batzulnetas Fishery. An  
NPS fishing permit is also required to  
19 participate in the Glennallen Fishery. At  
present a Federal season has not been  
20 established for the Chitina Subdistrict,  
although 17(b), which we discussed  
21 yesterday, would establish that season.

Proposal 17(b), which we  
22 discussed yesterday, also addresses the  
issue of Federally qualified fishers  
23 obtaining permits for both the Glennallen  
Subdistrict and the Chitina Subdistrict  
24 within the same year. Although the harvest  
limit in combination will remain the same as  
25 it is now for Glennallen Subdistrict alone.

If Proposal 20 were put into

1 regulation and was adopted as proposed, a  
2 household which was issued a subsistence  
3 permit to take salmon in the Batzulnetas  
4 Fishery could also be issued permits for  
5 Glennallen and/or Chitina subdistricts if  
6 the household qualified for those fisheries.  
7 This represents a broadening of subsistence  
8 opportunity. Current regulation allows only  
9 one permit to be issued per year to a  
10 household for the subsistence take of salmon  
11 in the Prince William Sound area. The  
12 participation level in the Batzulnetas  
13 Fishery has been very small, ranging from  
14 zero to eight permits issued since 1987.  
15 Harvest for the six years during the  
16 ten-year period, 1990 to '99 in which  
17 permits were issued averaged 298 sockeye  
18 salmon, which was less than point .02  
19 percent of the total sockeye salmon harvest  
20 in the Copper River Fisheries. So there  
21 were six years in which permits were  
22 actually issued in the 1990s, and for those  
23 six years the permits were out there, the  
24 harvest was 298 sockeye salmon. That's less  
25 than 2/100ths of 1 percent of the Copper  
River sockeye harvest. The additive effect  
of allowing holders of Batzulnetas permits  
to also hold permits for the Glennallen or  
Chitina subdistricts is minimal to the very  
size of the Batzulnetas fishery.

16 The staff analysis recommends to  
17 support the proposal.

18 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

19 Any questions for Larry?

20 If not, we will go to the Alaska  
21 Department of Fish -- I forgot to use the  
22 microphone.

23 Any questions for Larry?

24 With that, we'll go on to the  
25 Alaska Department of Fish & Game report.

26 MR. SWANTON: Good morning,  
27 Mr. Chairman, Board members.

28 This is the staff comments for  
29 Proposal No. 20. The State supports this  
30 proposal as it would allow one permit per  
31 subdistrict per season. It would thus allow  
32 Batzulnetas permit holders to also get a  
33 permit for the Upper Copper River District.

1 The limited number of permits issued for the  
2 Batzulnetas Fishery and the low harvest of  
3 salmon that has occurred in this fishery has  
4 likely resulted in the qualified users  
5 obtaining fish from the Glennallen  
6 Subdistrict users. Under State management,  
7 Batzulnetas permit holders were not eligible  
8 for permits in the Glennallen or Chitina  
9 subdistricts and were not issued permits if  
10 they already possessed permits for the  
11 Batzulnetas Fishery. Permits for the  
12 Glennallen or Chitina subdistricts may have  
13 been obtained by related family members, but  
14 not by those listed on the Batzulnetas  
15 fishing permit.

16 The proposal is reasonable and  
17 provides flexibility for subsistence  
18 harvesters. The State maintains that  
19 harvests taken in either area should count  
20 towards a single seasonal household limit of  
21 500 for those households that obtain both  
22 permits, Mr. Chairman.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
25 Charlie?

26 No questions basically. You said  
27 the same thing they did that the fish should  
28 apply to a total fish for all permits,  
29 right?

30 MR. SWANTON: Yes, that is  
31 correct. I mean, we're assuming that the  
32 maximum is 500 fish per household.

33 MR. LOHSE: Larry?

34 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, what I  
35 heard from the Department comments was  
36 agreement in the analysis summary I  
37 presented, except the analysis summary and  
38 the analysis do not recommend that the  
39 Batzulnetas harvest count against the Upper  
40 Copper River District total, and that is  
41 what the Department recommends. The  
42 analysis recommends that as proposed by the  
43 proponent, the Resource Commission,  
44 Subsistence Resource Commission, a holder of  
45 a Batzulnetas permit could also obtain a  
46 Chitina and/or Glennallen Subdistrict

1 permit. So we're in agreement there.

2 But the proponent and my analysis  
3 do not recommend -- do not argue for that  
4 harvest in Batzulnetas counting against the  
5 Upper Copper River District total.

6 In other words, when we talked  
7 yesterday about 17(b) harvests in the  
8 Glennallen Subdistrict and/or the Chitina  
9 Subdistrict it would be allowed to run up to  
10 a total of the current Glennallen harvest.  
11 We're saying here that the Batzulnetas  
12 permit would not count against that total.  
13 We didn't think that the harvest level in  
14 Batzulnetas was large enough to be a concern  
15 such that we had to have a three-permit  
16 total, and such a person would have to carry  
17 all those permits with them when they're  
18 fishing in any one district. We were  
19 viewing the Batzulnetas Fishery as a  
20 permitted fishery separate from the other  
21 two and the totals wouldn't count to a grand  
22 total limit.

23 MR. LOHSE: Was that mostly just  
24 for bookkeeping and permit carrying sake, or  
25 was there actually a request to have those  
26 fish not count towards the total so that  
27 there could be more fish taken, or was it --  
28 is it -- like I said, is it mostly just so  
29 that it's easier to keep records and  
30 permit -- so you don't have to do quite such  
31 complicated permitting?

32 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
33 proposal doesn't specifically request that  
34 this not count against the Upper Copper  
35 River District total. It doesn't argue for  
36 that exclusion. It simply says they're  
37 asking that a person holding such a permit  
38 not be excluded from obtaining one or more  
39 permits for those downriver districts.

40 MR. LOHSE: Do you see a problem  
41 with the proponents or the people involved  
42 having a seasonal total that equals the  
43 seasonal total of the residents of the  
44 subsistence fishery up there?

45 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, it's  
not a problem in terms of regulatory

1 development and enforcement -- we could  
2 require that such a permit holder carry  
3 all -- any and all permits with them if they  
4 have multiple permits, just like fishers in  
5 the Upper Copper River District. It was  
6 just that the harvest levels have been so  
7 small in the Batzulnetas Fishery that it  
8 didn't seem like at this point that  
9 requirement was a conservation factor. But  
10 it's not a problem to do the bookkeeping or  
11 permit issuance, no. It just wasn't seen as  
12 necessary at this point. If the harvest  
13 levels grew or for some other reason became  
14 something that needed to be addressed, we  
15 felt that we could require that later, but  
16 we're not opposed to such a requirement.

17  
18 MR. LOHSE: I guess that's what I  
19 was asking if the proponent or the people  
20 involved were opposed to it. It seems to me  
21 like for consistency's sake, it would be --  
22 you know, just for a feeling of fairness  
23 amongst all of the users that it would be  
24 consistent to have the total bag limit for  
25 everybody that's on the river, and I just  
26 was wondering if there was a problem with  
27 that.

28 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the --  
29 those of us involved in regulatory review  
30 aren't opposed to what you just said. I  
31 can't speak for the proponents. Maybe  
32 others here can.

33 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
34 Are there any other agencies that  
35 have comment -- any other questions for  
36 Larry or John?

37 Thank you.  
38 Are there any other agencies that  
39 have comments on this? Parks Service?

40 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman, Eric  
41 Veach, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. I  
42 might be able to give you just a little bit  
43 of clarity, kind of the thoughts as far as  
44 how the number of fish would be distributed  
45 between the permits, sort of our original  
46 thought I think what they were getting at to  
47 fish at the Batzulnetas Fisheries to fish

1 downstream. Some of the fish may not show  
2 up at the creek; it's a variable run. As  
3 far as putting those fish against the  
4 Glennallen fish. Batzulnetas also occurs  
5 upstream. The fish swim through the  
6 Glennallen District. And through  
7 Batzulnetas -- there's not really any  
8 incentive, I guess, to go downstream to get  
9 fish in the Glennallen fish district. As I  
10 think you're aware, there's no limit to the  
11 Batzulnetas Fisheries, as far as -- as far  
12 as taking the fish that were say caught in  
13 the Glennallen District, and applying it to  
14 the Batzulnetas Fisheries, since there's no  
15 limit in the Batzulnetas Fishery, by the  
16 time folks are catching fish in the  
17 Batzulnetas, there's no reason to go down  
18 and fish in the Batzulnetas district. Fred  
19 John might be able to answer a little  
20 better. I don't know that that would make  
21 much of a difference for the folks that were  
22 fishing there, if they had to apply the fish  
23 in the Glennallen Subdistrict. That's the  
24 reason we didn't address it. We just didn't  
25 think it would be an issue.

14 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Eric.  
That kind of explains things, somebody else  
15 to give us some clarification.

16 MR. GERHARD: My name is Bob  
Gerhard. I'm with the National Parks  
17 Service. I want to add one more piece to  
18 this. As you know, the Batzulnetas Fishery  
19 was operated under court order for many  
20 years, and that court order was for a  
21 thousand fish. So, even though that court  
22 order has been superseded by the  
23 regulations, I think people would be fairly  
24 nervous if a lower limit than that was  
25 imposed.

22 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

23 MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman, I  
believe that a thousand-fish limit was for  
24 those people collectively participating, not  
a thousand per permit.

25 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Charlie.



1           Are there any Fish & Game  
Advisory Committee to speak to it?  
2           Written public testimony?

3           MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, the  
only written comment we received is from  
4           CDF -- CDFU. Do you want to comment on  
that? So do you want to do that?  
5           She'll do that under public  
testimony.

6  
7           MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Ann.  
We'll go to public testimony. Gloria?

8           MS. GOODLATAW: My name is Betty  
Goodlataw. I'm representing Tazlina. CNR  
9           supports households with a permit to fish in  
the Batzulnetas and Upper Copper River  
10          District, using fishwheel, dip nets, rod and  
11          reel to keep the harvest limit the same as  
Glennallen Subdistrict.

12          MR. LOHSE: Basically to keep the  
harvest limit to the same as Glennallen  
13          Subdistrict?

14          MS. GOODLATAW: Right.

15          MR. LOHSE: Sue Aspelund?

16          MS. ASPELUND: Sue Aspelund,  
Cordova Fishermen United. Normally we  
17          wouldn't have commented on a proposal like  
this. However, we did comment. We are  
18          opposed to the language as we responded to  
it in June simply because the proposed  
19          regulatory language did not specifically  
speak to Batzulnetas, and we felt that would  
20          create confusion in the minds of the users.  
The justification spoken about, we knew what  
21          the issue was, but we fully support the  
language as it's currently written now.

22          MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Sue.

23          Okay. I don't think I have  
anybody else that's asked to speak to  
24          Proposal 20.

25          If I'm missing somebody, let me  
know. But I don't find anybody else that's  
down for 20.

1           Okay. At this point in time, a  
2 motion to put this proposal on the table is  
in order.

3           MS. SWAN: So move.

4           MR. LOHSE: It's been moved.  
Do I hear a second?

5           MR. JOHN: Second.

6           MR. LOHSE: It's been seconded.  
7 And the proposal is that a household may  
also be issued a Batzulnetas Fishery permit  
8 in the same year. Households with the  
National Parks Service permit to fish in  
9 Batzulnetas will also be allowed to obtain  
additional Federal permits, one per  
10 household, to fish in the Upper Copper  
District.

11           One per subdistrict. That means  
they could have one in Batzulnetas, one in  
12 Upper Copper, Glennallen Subdistrict, and  
one in Chitina District.

13           MR. ELVSASS: That's three.

14           MR. LOHSE: That's one per  
15 district.

16           MR. ELVSASS: Okay. I follow  
you, one per district.

17           MR. LOHSE: Okay. Discussion?

18           MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, could  
19 you clarify what the harvest number is  
allowed under the permits, please? Or would  
20 be allowed with these permits?

21           MR. LOHSE: Underneath this --  
underneath this, the way it's written, they  
22 would be allowed 500 in the Upper Copper and  
unlimited in the Batzulnetas.

23           Am I correct on that, Larry?

24           MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I  
wanted to mention that when we discussed  
25 17(b) yesterday. You read into the record  
the full regulatory language for 17(b) which

1 specified the harvest limits that would be  
2 in place for Glennallen Subdistrict and the  
3 new Federal Fishery in the Chitina  
4 Subdistrict and the upper limit is the  
5 number you said with an application for an  
6 expansion from their base limit, a household  
7 could go up to 500 salmon, you're right.  
8 And as other people have commented from the  
9 Parks Service this morning, the Batzulnetas  
10 Fishery currently does not have a harvest  
11 limit. So, the effect of the proposal  
12 modification you talked about this morning  
13 of pooling the three permits into one total  
14 limit would have the effect of imposing a  
15 limit on the Batzulnetas Fishery. If they  
16 can only go up to the total currently in  
17 place downriver in Glennallen or Chitina, it  
18 would have the effect of implementing an  
19 upper limit for Batzulnetas permit and that  
20 permit currently doesn't carry a limit.

21 MR. LOHSE: Larry, as I  
22 understand it, though, the way that this is  
23 written, this does not impose a limit on the  
24 Batzulnetas Fishery; it imposes the same  
25 limit that applies on the Upper Copper  
26 Fishery to the Upper Copper Fishery permit,  
27 so consequently, there is a 500 total for  
28 the Upper Copper -- I mean, the maximum  
29 would be 500 total for the Upper Copper  
30 permit, but there still would be no total  
31 for the Batzulnetas Fishery, the way this  
32 proposal is written.

33 MR. BUKLIS: That's exactly  
34 correct.

35 MR. LOHSE: So, if there was  
36 going to be a total limit, an amendment  
37 would have to be added?

38 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, if you wanted  
39 to require that a person holding a  
40 Batzulnetas permit could only catch up to  
41 the limits currently in place downriver that  
42 would be an amendment you would have to work  
43 on to this regulatory language, that's  
44 correct.

45 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

1 Fred?

2 MR. ELVSASS: I was just  
3 wondering, approximately how many people  
4 would qualify for the permits from  
5 Batzulnetas? As I understand it, there's  
6 been between one and eight applied, but how  
7 many would be eligible, about?

8 MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman, Vice  
9 Chair, on page 137 of your book, it's got a  
10 bunch -- it has a bunch of historical  
11 information that might be valuable to you at  
12 this juncture. It references in 1994, five  
13 permits were issued and 997 sockeye, '95,  
14 four permits; no permits in '96. Three  
15 permits in '97. One permit in '98, and one  
16 permit in '99 with an average harvest of  
17 sockeye in Batzulnetas Fishery of 298.

18 MR. LOHSE: And, Charlie, that's  
19 a total harvest for all the permits  
20 involved. That's not an individual family  
21 harvest, right?

22 MR. SWANTON: That is correct.  
23 298 is an average of all of the permits that  
24 fished and the total number of fish that  
25 were harvested in that fishery.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Charlie.

MR. ELVSASS: Fred, what do you  
think?

MR. JOHN: I really don't know --  
I think -- I think probably one permit.  
Usually everybody shared a permit. We  
hardly catch any sometime. I don't think  
that's hardly anything. Mostly -- most of  
the time we fished there it's probably  
during the camp at Batzulnetas -- we have a  
camp every year -- they put the fishwheel in  
toward the end of June, and it's a long way,  
so you had to almost, you know, go down  
there almost -- it's shut off, you know,  
when nobody's there, so the only time the  
fishwheel is running is when somebody goes  
down there and camps there for a couple  
days. And they only got one fishwheel

1     there.

2             MR. LOHSE: Larry?

3             MR. BUKLIS: Thank you,  
4     Mr. Chairman. Yes, and to follow up on  
5     Charlie's response in terms of harvest  
6     numbers, if you're getting at how many users  
7     are eligible for Batzulnetas, the C and T --  
8     the Federal C and T is Mentasta Lake and Dot  
9     Lake residents. So residents of those two  
10    communities are eligible to apply for a  
11    permit?

12            MR. LOHSE: Yes. But if I  
13    remember right, that's basically private  
14    property there and it's a very limited  
15    amount of people that can use it. I was  
16    going to ask Fred a question. So,  
17    basically, it's used at the culture camp and  
18    is the permit for the fishwheel as a whole  
19    or is it issued to individual families?

20            MR. JOHN: Usually, one person  
21    gets a permit there, and they just share a  
22    fish there, so it goes to the whole village.  
23    They don't really catch that much there.  
24    Everybody shared a fish in the culture camp  
25    and whatever they actually got, just issued  
26    one permit.

27            MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Fred.

28            MR. JOHN: I want to make another  
29    comment, Mr. Chairman. But the fish gotten  
30    up in our area, they're not as good down in  
31    Chitina and Copper -- I mean they're edible.  
32    They're still good, but we like -- we like  
33    actually Chitina -- we like fish that's  
34    fresher.

35            (Laughter.)

36            MR. LOHSE: I know what you mean.  
37    After you eat the fish off of the flats,  
38    it's hard to eat them in Chitina.

39            (Laughter.)

40            MR. LOHSE: As this proposal is

1 written, basically, what we're dealing with  
is we're dealing with whether or not we feel  
2 that the Batzulnetas Fishery and the  
additional fish will impact the total catch  
3 on the run from the information we've been  
given. I don't see that at this point in  
4 time.

If it would ever become a  
5 problem, at that point in time, it imposes a  
total limit on it if that's what we want to  
6 do. As the proposal is written right now,  
basically what it just says is that person  
7 that puts the fishwheel down in Batzulnetas  
can also go down and fish in the Upper  
8 Copper. That would also explain why the  
number of permits at Batzulnetas is so low,  
9 because they have no incentive to put more  
than one permit in there because they're not  
10 taking that for fish. They're using the  
wheel for that type of a purpose.

11 I guess I don't see any problem  
with it the way it's proposed, as much as I  
12 did to start off with.

13 MR. ELVSASS: Mr. Chairman, as I  
understand it, one person gets the permit  
14 for a fishwheel; is that right?

15 MR. JOHN: Yes, usually.

16 MR. ELVSASS: That person is  
going to have, say, 300 fish counted against  
17 their take. So, it wouldn't be fair to that  
person because they do share these fish  
18 amongst the village to say, "Well, you can  
only get 200 for yourself downriver." So, I  
19 don't think it would be right to expect that  
permit -- if he needed 400 fish, he's not  
20 going to put the fishwheel in at  
Batzulnetas. So, I think, you know, well,  
21 you look at it in that light, it's such a  
small amount of fish in totals that we're  
22 better off not to have those fish counted.  
If it gets to be a problem where there's a  
23 high user and a lot of fish come in, then it  
would be a different matter. But it's my  
24 understanding a run by that time up there is  
not that much.

25 Isn't that right?  
They must probably be catching

1     probably 10 or 15 fish a day.

2             MR. JOHN: Probably.

3             MR. ELVSASS: So, I couldn't  
4     support any notion to include those fish in  
5     the total for the Glennallen and Chitina  
6     count.

7             MR. LOHSE: Okay. Well, then if  
8     there's no further discussion, the question  
9     is in order.

10            MR. ELVSASS: Question.

11            MR. LOHSE: The question has been  
12   called. All those in favor of the Proposal  
13   20 as read, signify by saying "aye."

14            COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

15            MR. LOHSE: All opposed, signify  
16   by saying "nay."  
17   Motion carries.

18            With that, we're going to go on  
19   with Proposal No. 18.

20            MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
21   staff analysis for Proposal 18 is on page  
22   124 in the council book. Page 124.

23            This proposal for the Upper  
24   Copper River District was submitted by the  
25   Subsistence Resource Commission for  
26   Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and  
27   Preserve. It requests that regulations be  
28   corrected regarding retention of  
29   rainbow/steelhead trout caught in fishwheels  
30   and dip nets and that those legally retained  
31   from a fishwheel have the dorsal fin removed  
32   immediately.

33            Current regulations prohibit  
34   retention of rainbow/steelhead trout taken  
35   incidentally by fishwheel. However, these  
36   fish are typically dead or incapable of  
37   survival after release and the regulation is  
38   not being enforced. Regulations allow  
39   retention of rainbow/steelhead trout taken  
40   incidentally in subsistence net fisheries  
41   targeting other fish species. The rationale  
42   for this was that fish captured in gil net

1 fisheries are either dead or incapable of  
2 surviving after release. But a dip net  
3 fishery is also a net fishery.

4 Fish captured by dip net should  
5 be able to survive after release.

6 State regulation for the  
7 subsistence dip net fishery in the Chitina  
8 Subdistrict does require immediate release  
9 of rainbow/steelhead trout without further  
10 harm.

11 This is not required in State  
12 regulations for the Glennallen Subdistrict,  
13 although the proponent notes that many  
14 dipnetters voluntarily release rainbow and  
15 steelhead trout unharmed to the water.  
16 Steelhead are the anadromous form of rainbow  
17 trout. Rainbow and steelhead trout in the  
18 Upper Copper River Drainage are considered  
19 among the northernmost wild stocks of the  
20 species in North America. The rainbow  
21 steelhead population in the area are thought  
22 to be relatively small and not productive,  
23 as compared to elsewhere in the range.  
24 Harvest of wild rainbow trout in sport  
25 fisheries in the Copper River drainage  
during the 1990s averaged 944 fish per year,  
while wild harvest of steelhead trout  
averaged 18. Unpublished subsistence data  
permits indicate that incidental fishwheel  
harvest of steelhead ranges from about 14  
fish to 114 per year.

The proposed regulatory changes  
would recognize current practice by allowing  
the retention of rainbow and steelhead trout  
taken incidentally by fishwheels. As  
proposed, removal of the dorsal fin would be  
required immediately, so as to remove  
potential trophy value of these trout.

However, current regulations regarding  
marking of subsistence-caught salmon  
require removal of both lobes of the tail  
fin. Consistency in the regulations as to  
how these fish could be marked in the Copper  
River would mean less potential for  
confusion among fishers.

In the interest of conservation,  
it should be required that rainbow and  
steelhead trout caught by dip net be  
released unharmed immediately. So in  
conclusion, the analysis recommends support



1 with modification. Require that both lobes  
2 of the caudal fin instead of the dorsal fin  
3 be removed from rainbow and steelhead trout  
4 retained for subsistence purposes, but that  
5 in agreement with the proposal, rainbow and  
6 steelhead trout caught by fishwheel may be  
7 retained and rainbow and steelhead trout  
8 caught by dip net should be released  
9 immediately without further harm.

10 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.  
11 Basically, the staff recommendations are the  
12 change of the dorsal fin to caudal fin and  
13 otherwise the support of the proposal as  
14 written?

15 MR. BUKLIS: That's correct,  
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
18 Any questions for Larry?

19 MR. ELVSASS: Yes. Is this in  
20 addition to the tail fins being cut off?  
21 Trim this whole fish?

22 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, this  
23 modification would say instead of clipping  
24 the dorsal fin, instead of that, to clip the  
25 tail fin, because that would be the same as  
26 what's required with the salmon that are  
27 caught. So there wouldn't be confusion  
28 about which fins to mark.

29 MR. ELVSASS: But initially, when  
30 they were going to cut the dorsal fin, they  
31 were going to cut all three.

32 MR. BUKLIS: No, the proponent  
33 was saying for trout clip the dorsal fin --

34 MR. ELVSASS: But not the tail.

35 MR. BUKLIS: My analysis suggests  
36 shifting to the tail fin like for salmon.

37 MR. LOHSE: Larry, later on we  
38 have a proposal in front of us that we  
39 haven't handled yet to drop the clipping of  
40 the caudal fin for the subsistence-caught

1 salmon. So, if we did that, and I'm not  
2 saying we're going to do that, and then we  
3 clipped the tail fin for the steelhead, we  
4 wouldn't be consistent, because that would  
5 be the only one we'd have to do. In that  
6 case, the dorsal fin would be just as  
7 adequate. But, anyhow, I was just wondering  
8 whether that was taken into consideration  
9 when the suggestion to clip the caudal fin  
10 was made?

11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, you're  
12 correct. If Proposal No. 22, I believe it  
13 is, was passed as proposed, then marking of  
14 salmon would not be required anymore, and  
15 then you'd be free in terms of marking of  
16 trout for any fin mark you would have.  
17 Consistency wouldn't be a concern.

18 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
19 The question was whether we  
20 should defer this until we take the other  
21 one, but I don't think it causes any  
22 problem, because one way or the other we're  
23 going to want to mark steelhead and it  
24 really doesn't make any difference whether  
25 it's the caudal fin or dorsal fin if salmon  
26 aren't marked or are marked -- for the  
27 dorsal fin, they don't have the dorsal fin,  
28 they just have a fiberglass mount, and all  
29 they need is a picture. Let's go on to Fish  
30 & Game comments at this point in time.

31 MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman,  
32 Charlie Swanton, Alaska Department of Fish &  
33 Game.

34 State comments on Proposal  
35 No. 18. We support this. The proposal  
36 would revise regulations pertaining to the  
37 retention of rainbow trout and steelhead.  
38 The current regulation that was adopted into  
39 the Federal regulations was a statewide  
40 regulatory proposal in 1991. It was  
41 unintentionally applied to the Prince  
42 William Sound area subsistence regulations.  
43 Since 1990, the State's Glennallen  
44 Subdistrict subsistence salmon permit has  
45 requested that the harvest of steelhead  
46 trout be reported on the permit; as stated  
47 in the proposal this regulation has not been

1 actively enforced. The State intends to  
2 submit a proposal to the Alaska Board of  
3 Fisheries, during the next regulatory cycle.  
4 That would allow the harvest of steelhead  
5 trout in fishwheels and prohibit the  
6 retention of steelhead trout in dip nets in  
7 both the Chitina and Glennallen  
8 Subdistricts. If the proposal for --  
9 Federal Subsistence Board adopts Proposal  
10 No. 17, the Department suggests that the  
11 retention of steelhead by Federally  
12 qualified users that use fish wheels in the  
13 Chitina Subdistrict should be allowed. The  
14 Department notes that also a customary and  
15 traditional use finding is needed.

16 Mr. Chairman, one other, if the  
17 intent for this proposal is to maintain  
18 consistency between State and Federal  
19 regulations, on page 127 of your notebook,  
20 where it says the support would require  
21 removal of both lobes of the caudal fin, and  
22 the State regulation as it relates to salmon  
23 is just the tips of the lobes, Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. LOHSE: Thank you for that  
25 clarification, Charlie.

26 If I understand correctly, that  
27 proposal the State's going to be putting in  
28 is pretty well a mirror of this except that  
29 it will only be the tips of caudal fins,  
30 right?

31 MR. SWANTON: That is -- I can't  
32 project that that would be the case, but  
33 that would be likely.

34 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
35 Any questions of Charlie?

36 Thank you.  
37 Okay. At this point in time, any  
38 other agency have a comment on it?  
39 Eric?

40 MR. VEACH: Eric Veach,  
41 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and  
42 Preserve. I just wanted to mention that  
43 last week the Wrangell Subsistence Resource  
44 Commission met and held a subsistence  
45 workshop. It was not actually a formal  
46 meeting, so there was no vote taken.

1 Officially, the Commission is still in  
2 support of the proposal since they submitted  
3 it. One of the opinions that did come out  
4 that was discussed was they also felt that  
5 if we're going -- if the Board is going to  
6 find customary and traditional use for  
7 freshwater fish, it would make sense to  
8 actually extend this proposal to all  
9 freshwater fish that are accidentally  
10 captured in a fishwheel. If a burbot is  
11 found in a wheel, it would make sense, to  
12 keep the burbot, and not return any  
13 incidental fish taken in a fishwheel back  
14 into the river.

8 MR. LOHSE: Eric, am I correct in  
9 assuming from what you just said that at  
10 this point in time it's illegal to keep  
11 suckers and whitefish and burbot that are  
12 caught in a wheel?

11 MR. VEACH: I think -- Larry just  
12 told me that it is allowed. Our  
13 understanding, at least under the Federal  
14 Regulations, since there is no customary and  
15 traditional use for fish it would be  
16 allowed. I may be incorrect.

15 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, Pat.

16 MS. PETRIVELLI: I should be an  
17 expert on this, but I think if there hasn't  
18 been a determination, it's all rural  
19 residents. It hadn't been -- it's rural  
20 residents, absent to any specific finding,  
21 it begins with the rural Alaskans.

19 MR. LOHSE: So, currently, it  
20 is -- it is or it is not illegal to keep  
21 incidental freshwater fish caught in a  
22 fishwheel?

22 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, I  
23 think if you're fishing with your salmon  
24 permit and you incidentally catch other  
25 species of fish, you are allowed to keep  
26 them.

25 But the problem is that  
26 rainbow/steelhead trout has that language  
27 that speaks to them specifically. It says

1 if you catch them in a net fishery, they may  
2 be retained. So fishwheel fisheries are not  
3 net fisheries, so they can't be retained.  
4 That's the irony of the situation, so we're  
5 trying to clarify the regulations. If you  
6 catch rainbow/steelhead trout in a fishwheel  
and they're going to be dead, they should be  
kept and not wasted. The dip net is a dip  
net fishery, and that kind of fishery should  
be required to release the rainbow trout  
since they have a good chance of survival.

7 MR. LOHSE: Then for my  
8 clarification, the reason that this is  
9 addressed is because rainbow and steelhead  
10 are specifically mentioned in other  
11 regulations, and other incidental caught  
12 fish not being specifically mentioned are  
13 legal to keep. So, in other words, if you  
14 get whitefish in your dip wheel or suckers,  
15 you legally are allowed to keep them;  
16 steelhead at this point in time, because  
17 they're mentioned in other regulations, you  
18 are not?

19 MR. BUKLIS: That's my  
20 understanding, yes.

21 MR. LOHSE: Does anybody in the  
22 audience have a different understanding on  
23 that?

24 Thank you.  
25 Okay. Do we have any Fish & Game  
Advisory Committee comments on it?  
Summary of written public  
comments?

MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, the  
only written comment was from Cordova  
fishermen -- Cordova District Fishermen  
United and again, I'll defer to Sue  
Aspelund.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
Okay. Public testimony. Do we  
have -- I think we have Gloria on this one.

MS. STICKWAN: We support  
subsistence users who harvest fish from  
fishwheels to keep incidental catch of

1 rainbow trout and steelhead in the Copper  
2 River with the reservation that they have to  
3 cut off the caudal tail. Those who catch  
4 steelhead and rainbow with the dip net  
5 should return it. It would be alive.

6 MR. LOHSE: If I understand you,  
7 you support the retention of fishwheels,  
8 release of dip nets, but you object to  
9 cutting off the caudal tail?

10 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

11 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
12 Gloria?

13 Is she here? She said that she  
14 wanted to testify on Proposal 18. She's not  
15 here.

16 Is there any other public  
17 testimony?

18 Hearing none, a motion to put  
19 this on the table is in order.

20 MR. ELVSASS: I'll make the  
21 motion.

22 MS. SWAN: Second.

23 MR. ELVSASS: As written.

24 MR. LOHSE: As written.

25 MS. SWAN: Still second.

MR. LOHSE: Still second.

As written, that's as it was  
originally presented, not with staff --

MR. ELVSASS: (Nods head.)

MR. LOHSE: What it says, if you  
take rainbow/steelhead, steelhead trout  
incidentally in other subsistence net  
fisheries, you're to retain them for  
subsistence, except when taken by dip net  
where they must be immediately released,  
unharmd to the water. Rainbow/steelhead  
trout caught incidental to other species by  
fishwheel may be retained.  
Rainbow/steelhead trout retained for  
subsistence purposes will have the dorsal

1 fin removed immediately.  
2 Discussion?

3 MR. ELVSASS: Mr. Chairman, as I  
4 understand it, Gloria just testified that  
5 they didn't want the caudal fins cut. And  
6 if something must be cut, then it's logical  
7 that it should be the dorsal fin. I don't  
8 have a strong feeling one way or the other,  
9 but that was the proposal, and I think, you  
10 know, that it should be marked as  
11 subsistence fish rather than trophy fishing  
12 in some sense, and this is the proper way to  
13 do it.

14 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Fred.  
15 Again, I think we have to  
16 remember the number of fish that we're  
17 dealing with here.

18 MR. ELVSASS: Yeah.

19 MR. LOHSE: From reports, we're  
20 dealing with 14 to 115. We're probably  
21 talking close to 15, if I have my  
22 information correct.  
23 Larry?

24 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
25 that is the range, but I'm just asking  
perhaps Gloria would want to come back up  
and clarify. The way I heard her comments,  
it wasn't so much that particular fin as the  
marking of the fish. I don't think she was  
preferring one mark over the other. I think  
she was preferring not to mark.

MR. LOHSE: Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: That's true. No  
marking on the fish.

MR. ELVSASS: Just no markings?

MS. STICKWAN: It's not customary  
and traditional for us to do that. It's  
more work for us to do that. So -- and we  
think that was primarily geared for the  
dipnetters, not for fishery users.

MR. ELVSASS: At this time, are  
the salmon marked?

1

MR. LOHSE: Yes.

2

MR. ELVSASS: It's kind of  
ironic, because I know some people in  
Anchorage that brought fish in from the  
Copper River, and they had no markings.  
There was nothing. They were fish; tails  
were on; none of the ends were clipped.

I know on the Kenai, they watch  
that fairly close, but that's why I just  
assumed they caught them and brought them  
home. I don't even know if they were aware.  
I'm sure they must be aware that they had to  
mark them, but for 114 fish, if you have a  
fishwheel permit, it's obvious you caught  
them in the fishwheel. If you have just a  
dip net permit, you shouldn't have them at  
all. I don't think the marking is really  
going to be that great of an issue.

11

Thank you.

12

MR. LOHSE: Fred, I think part of  
the reason for the marking is we have a very  
fast-growing sport fishery up in the Upper  
Copper, and they are a steelhead from Alaska  
and classed as a trophy fish, and  
consequently, there -- with the possibility  
of subsistence-caught fish being allowed to  
be sold, that would be one way that they  
could enter the sport fishing market, and I  
think that was part of the reason behind  
wanting the marking.

15

I see we have somebody with a  
hand up there. Wilson, would you like to  
come and testify?

19

MR. JUSTIN: Thank you, and good  
morning. I just wanted to mention for your  
edification, I was glad to hear the  
discussion on the marking. We have one of  
those individual conflicts between western  
management systems and Indian traditions.  
It's very difficult for Indians to mutilate  
fish in any way, shape, or form. You catch  
them, you use them, and you eat them.  
That's why you don't have fly fishermen  
among Indians. We can't get used to the  
idea that it's not playing with fish when  
you catch them on a hook and line.

25



1           None of the Elders that I know of  
2   mark the fish, and I don't think even under  
3   the threat of a fine, I don't think you  
4   could make them cut or mark a fish, probably  
5   the younger people and the generation after  
6   me would get used to the idea and be able to  
7   function in that sense, but none of the  
8   Elders that I know, around the Copper River  
9   would ever be able to get comfortable or  
10   accept that practice. I'm glad it's brought  
11   out in the open finally, because I think  
12   it's very unfair and disrespectful to the  
13   Copper River Elders to have a management  
14   tool of that sort on the books knowing in  
15   advance that they're not capable of reacting  
16   to that particular tool.

17           My suggestion is forget about the  
18   marking. We've been catching for a good  
19   many years now, and I don't think that it  
20   makes any real difference in terms of  
21   management whether you mark the fish or not.  
22   And the only other comment that I have is I  
23   don't know the extent of the steelhead  
24   trout and rainbows that go up the river. I  
25   think somewhere along the line we should  
26   determine the extent of those -- those fish.  
27   They may go up as far as Mentasta, who  
28   knows. As far as I know, they go as far as  
29   Batzulnetas, the very late, late run. I  
30   thank you for the opportunity to make my  
31   remarks. Thank you again.

32           MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
33   Wilson?

34           Thank you.  
35   Larry?

36           MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, just  
37   following up on that comment, Doug McBride  
38   will be presenting the FIS work later in the  
39   day; but I think FIS, Fisheries Information  
40   Services, has funded some steelhead research  
41   in the Copper River Drainage.

42           MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
43   I see what Wilson is talking  
44   about because I can understand that  
45   conflict. At the same time I understand the  
46   conflict that we're dealing with when we  
47   deal with the road system and a lot of

1 people who don't have that kind of ethic  
 2 like fish that you saw in Anchorage that  
 3 were unmarked. One of the reasons for  
 4 marking fish by people who come from other  
 5 places is that they can come back and catch  
 6 them again.

7 We have the same problem in  
 8 Cordova with people sport fishing and  
 9 catching a limit in the morning, catching a  
 10 limit in the afternoon. And it would be  
 11 nice -- it would be nice if we lived in a  
 12 world that all had the same ethics as some  
 13 of our Elders, but we don't live in that  
 14 kind of world anymore. And I know that the  
 15 enforcement on it has not been very  
 16 consistent simply because it's one of those  
 17 issues that politically you can't enforce it  
 18 on everybody and so you don't enforce it on  
 19 anybody.

20 But, it is something that we have  
 21 to recognize that it's a possibility that  
 22 we'll need those kind of tools to deal with  
 23 the kind -- the amount of people and the  
 24 pressure that we have on it. It's up to the  
 25 Council to decide what to do on something  
 like that.

It reminds me of a story, but I  
 won't tell it right now.

(Laughter.)

MR. JOHN: Go ahead.

MR. LOHSE: Anyhow, any further  
 discussion on this?

MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, I just  
 thank -- thank you, Wilson, for that  
 information, but I just wanted to say that  
 down on the Kenai, the removal of the tail  
 lobes is very rigorously enforced and  
 there's good reason for it; but in our  
 tribe, the Elders, a lot of the Elders were  
 furious with us and so -- and I have -- my  
 aunt lives with me, and she thought we were  
 being disrespectful because we didn't mark  
 the fish -- because we marked the fish, and  
 she said you know you can't waste any of the  
 parts. So, what we did was recognizing that  
 you have to have this tool, we just saved

1 the tail lobes and brought them home and let  
the Elders boil them and cook them. That  
2 sort of -- we still got called out for it,  
but we weren't wasteful, so I understand  
3 that that's really something that we should  
consider. However, in view of all the  
4 other -- the immigrants, I think we need the  
tool.

5 Thank you.

6  
MR. LOHSE: Any other discussions  
7 or recommendations?

8 MR. ELVSASS: I'd like to hear  
from Council Members what they would prefer  
9 cutting, the dorsal fin or the tail fin.

If we're going to cut them, we're  
10 only talking about very few fish. Salmon  
right now, you have to do. So, if we're  
11 going to talk about cutting the tail fin,  
then we need to amend this. Otherwise it  
12 would just be the dorsal fin.

13 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chairman --

14 MR. LOHSE: Fred?

15 MR. JOHN: What the proposal says  
right now, cut the dorsal fin, not the tail  
16 fin.

17 MR. JOHN: What Wilson brought  
up, I agree with that with the Elders. I  
18 think this regulation should come in effect,  
because I don't think we have that much law  
19 enforcement in that area yet, but eventually  
with all the fishermen coming in, you know,  
20 I think it would be a little bit good, you  
know.

21 I don't know. I never cut my  
tail fin myself before either, never cut it.  
22 Never thought about it.

23 (Laughter.)

24  
MR. LOHSE: The problem, that we  
25 don't realize is that all of us are getting  
close to being Elders, and it's possible --

1

MR. ELVSASS: Close?

2

MR. LOHSE: It's possible before  
they have enforcement on it we'll be gone.

4

(Laughter.)

5

MR. LOHSE: I know that -- I know  
the reasoning behind it. I can understand  
the problems that causes -- I do think that,  
you know, for certain parts of the  
fisheries, it's a tool that's needed. I  
guess I would hope that -- I would hope some  
wisdom and discretion was applied in  
applying it.

9

I'll tell you the story.

10

(Laughter.)

11

MR. LOHSE: Two years ago -- some  
of you know that I have a charter license,  
and two years ago the Coast Guard came down  
to check for enforcement with all the  
regulations on charter licenses. One of the  
things, you have to have a random drug test  
and you have to have all the rest of the  
stuff. So we have this -- have this old man  
in Cordova in his 80s that was running a  
charter business. He didn't have any of the  
licenses. He didn't have any of the drug  
permits and everything else. A little Coast  
Guard went around and she ticketed all us  
young people that didn't have everything in  
order. Some of us did have everything in  
order. I did, thank goodness. She got to  
him and he basically told her, "I was  
chartering before you were ever born, and  
I'll be -- if I'm going to comply to any of  
these regulations."

21

What do you do? You take an  
80-year- old person to court and throw him  
in jail? No, you just try to get them to do  
the things for safety purposes, and you know  
that he's not going to cause any problem and  
one of these days he's not going to be there  
chartering anymore. That's exactly what  
happened.

25

And I think that, you know,  
sometimes we have to apply that kind of

1 wisdom. It's awful hard to change an  
2 80-year-old man that's been taking people  
3 out fishing, for, you know, 50 years and  
4 tell him that, no, you can't do that because  
5 you don't have the right license anymore.

6 But it's not hard to tell a 40-  
7 or 50-year-old that you better get the right  
8 license or you're going to spend ten years  
9 in jail.

10 I think that's the kind of thing  
11 that I hope our enforcement has that kind of  
12 discretion or that kind of wisdom. But for  
13 us younger ones and for the ones that are  
14 coming after, like, Wilson said, and for the  
15 mass of other people that are coming in and  
16 using the resource, sometimes these tools  
17 are needed. And I'm afraid myself, as much  
18 as I can understand the Elders not wanting  
19 to do it, and I don't expect them to do it,  
20 I have to support having them marked,  
21 because I know -- I know the -- I know the  
22 mentality of some of the guides and some of  
23 the people that come in sport fishing that  
24 would be very willing to take advantage of  
25 it. And from that standpoint, I won't  
support it if there's no marking on it.

MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. LOHSE: Roy?

MR. EWAN: I'm pretty familiar  
with taking tail fins, cutting off the tails  
off of salmon in the Copper River. It's not  
an easy job. If somebody did say it's  
difficult for the Elders, I really believe  
that. I really truly believe that it's a  
hardship on them. And if you're talking  
about, whatever species you're talking about  
here, trout or rainbow, there's so few  
caught, it wouldn't matter. I don't think  
it's necessary to make it hard for people  
that accidentally catch either steelhead or  
other species that are not normally caught  
in the river, the Copper River. And the  
fishwheel, I don't like the idea of --  
especially if you have a dull knife, no  
chopping block or something to use at the  
time. And for an Elder, it's a hard job for  
that person.

1 I don't care to do this, but I'll  
2 have to go along with the majority and if  
3 it's necessary to cut the tail fins or  
4 whatever fin. It has to be cut, I'll go  
5 along with that. I don't think it's good  
6 for the Elders, not good for me, I know  
7 that. I don't want to do it.

8 MR. LOHSE: I agree with you Roy.  
9 It's a hard job to do if you've got no knife  
10 and no chopping block. What I found to work  
11 better for me is scissors. I try packing  
12 scissors. It works much better than trying  
13 to use a knife. But that's not recommending  
14 that everybody carries scissors with them  
15 either.

16 MR. ELVSASS: You can't get on  
17 the airplane with scissors.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
20 discussion on this proposal?  
21 For the proposal in general, we  
22 seem to have good support from all parties  
23 involved. It's just the question of whether  
24 or not you want to support the marking  
25 that's written in the proposal or not.  
Nothing further?

MR. ELVSASS: Roy, at your  
fishwheel, which would you prefer, the  
dorsal fins or the tail fins?

MR. EWAN: Most likely a tail  
fin. Maybe it would be easier to do the  
dorsal fin, I don't know. Myself, I use a  
block. I do have a block; use a little  
knife for the salmon.

MR. ELVSASS: For the dorsal fin,  
you'd have to hold the fish and cut the fin  
off with the knife.

MR. EWAN: That would be easier  
for some people.

MR. ELVSASS: If somebody wanted  
that, they could still save the fin. The

1 dorsal fin is a rich piece of fish when you  
2 boil it.

3 MR. LOHSE: If nobody is going to  
4 offer an amendment, then the question is in  
5 order.

6 MR. ELVSASS: Question.

7 MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
8 called.

9 All in favor of the proposal,  
10 signify by saying "aye."

11 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

12 MR. LOHSE: All opposed, signify  
13 by saying "nay."

14 Proposal carries.  
15 Okay. Let's take a break.

16 (Break.)

17 MR. LOHSE: We'll call this  
18 meeting of the Southcentral Regional  
19 Advisory Council to order. We'll go to  
20 Proposal 21.

21 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr.  
22 Chairman, the staff draft analysis for  
23 Proposal 21 will be found on page 142 in the  
24 council book, page 142.

25 Mr. Chairman, our prior  
discussion covered the marking of the  
rainbow/steelhead trout and I said we'd be  
covering the marking of salmon. I said it  
was Proposal 22. It's proposal 21. This  
proposal for the Upper Copper River  
District, was submitted by the CRNA. The  
proposal requests that removal of both lobes  
of caudal or tail fin from  
subsistence-caught salmon no longer be  
required. The current requirement is seen  
as a burden, unnecessary, and not something  
that was customarily and traditionally done.  
The initial proposal, as submitted, would  
have retained the requirement for the  
removal of both lobes of the caudal fin from  
subsistence-caught salmon, but only for  
those fish taken by fishers from urban

1 areas, who are primarily dip net fishers.  
 2 The proponent claims that continuation of  
 3 the requirement for this urban user group to  
 4 mark salmon by removal of the caudal fin  
 5 will help to enforce harvest limits.

6 Since nonrural users are not  
 7 qualified to fish under Federal subsistence  
 8 fishing regulations, the urban user aspect  
 9 of the proposal cannot be incorporated into  
 10 the Federal Regulations. That would be a  
 11 matter for the State Regulatory Process.

12 The requirement to remove both  
 13 lobes of the caudal fin was incorporated  
 14 from existing State regulations beginning  
 15 October, 1999 in the Federal Regulations.

16 Marking of subsistence-caught  
 17 salmon by removal of a specified fin is  
 18 required in the Federal Regulations for  
 19 other areas as well, such as Yakutat,  
 20 Southeast Alaska, coho salmon in the Togiak  
 21 District of Bristol Bay, and chinook salmon  
 22 in the lower Yukon River.

23 Being required to remove both  
 24 lobes of the caudal fin from  
 25 subsistence-caught salmon may be perceived  
 negatively by subsistence fishers. However  
 it protects and promotes current subsistence  
 harvests by assisting in the enforcement of  
 regulations regarding sale of  
 subsistence-caught fish and it helps in the  
 regulation and the separation of subsistence  
 harvest limits from sport fish bag limits.

Discontinuation of the requirement in  
 Federal regulations would compromise  
 enforcement of State regulations, which is  
 already an area of concern for the  
 proponent.

Road system access to the Upper  
 Copper River District allows ready transport  
 of fish to markets which this regulation  
 would continue -- with this regulation  
 continues to protect against. The analysis  
 recommends to oppose the proposal.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.  
 Any questions from Council?

Larry, just out of curiosity,  
 this is just an idea on my part. Would  
 there be any advantage to be able to tell  
 Federal subsistence-caught fish from State



1 subsistence-caught fish or fish caught under  
2 a Federal permit and fish caught under a  
3 State permit, or do we interchange those two  
4 permits in the Upper Copper District? I was  
5 just thinking if there could be a variation,  
6 not an unmarked, but a variation in marks  
7 like only one lobe for Federal caught fish,  
8 two lobes for State-caught fish. Would  
9 there be any advantage to that, that you  
10 could see?

11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, one  
12 advantage might be if the Chitina  
13 Subdistrict Fishery takes shape as has been  
14 proposed, there would be different limits in  
15 that place for Federal and State users, and  
16 so if fish were required and, in fact,  
17 marked differently, that would indicate what  
18 catch limit you're operating under.

19 However, changing the mark  
20 requirement and having two different sets of  
21 mark requirements out on the river might  
22 contribute to confusion. So, I don't know  
23 how to balance those two factors.

24 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.  
25 Any other questions for Larry?  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

1 MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman, for  
2 the record, Charlie Swanton, Alaska  
3 Department of Fish & Game, Proposal 21. The  
4 State does not support this proposal. The  
5 proposal seeks to eliminate the requirement,  
6 Federal requirement on subsistence in the  
7 Federal River. This is presently a  
8 requirement in both State and Federal  
9 subsistence regulations for the Copper River  
10 and it is in place for sale of subsistence  
11 fish. The rule is not popular locally and  
12 the level of compliance with it is  
13 uncertain. As written, the proposal  
14 addresses rules governing subsistence  
15 fishing by non-Federally qualified fishers  
16 which is outside the jurisdiction of the  
17 Federal Subsistence Board. The regulation  
18 could be modified to no longer require  
19 removing all of the fin, but it cannot  
20 stipulate a requirement for those dipnetters  
21 from urban areas.

1           Adoption of this proposal would  
2     result in different rules for rural and  
3     nonrural subsistence fishers, all of whom  
4     are required to obtain State permits. It  
5     would create substantial enforcement  
6     problems and I would like to reiterate what  
7     Larry talked about in terms of the added  
8     time as it relates to commercial enterprise  
9     and the sale or the allowable sale of  
10    Federally caught fish as opposed to the  
11    State system which prohibits this activity,  
12    Mr. Chairman.

13           MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Charlie.  
14           Any questions for Charlie?  
15           Charlie, could you repeat that  
16           last part?

17           MR. SWANTON: I would just like  
18     to reiterate that we do have concerns with  
19     regards to the movement afoot with regard to  
20     defining commercial enterprise, and I don't  
21     know where this particular issue is with  
22     regards to the Federal staff discussions and  
23     input from the Federally qualified users and  
24     RACs and everything else.

25           However, under the State system,  
26     you know, the sale of subsistence-caught  
27     fish is not allowed. Under the Federal  
28     system, it would be allowed. It's my  
29     understanding.

30           Therein lies the problem with  
31     regards to marking and as you reiterated  
32     numerous times, and I appreciate your  
33     efforts in that regard, enforcement is also  
34     going to become an issue here.

35           MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Charlie.  
36           Larry?

37           MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, there  
38     are others here who are more expert in this  
39     in terms of the customary trade issue, but  
40     my understanding is that on the Federal  
41     side, Charlie is right that customary trade  
42     allowances do allow for sale of fish on the  
43     Federal side, but that is not including --  
44     that will not include sale to commercial  
45     fish processing plants for the commercial  
46     fisheries industry.

1

MR. LOHSE: Charlie?

2

MR. SWANTON: I think that the concern is more -- and I know that I've heard it voiced by numerous people, I think yourself included, as it relates to this particular area is well connected on the road system. There is more than ample opportunities that could arise, and I don't think that we've even broached the bare surface, the opportunities given the human mind can concoct with regard to this issue.

8

MR. LOHSE: Charlie, I think you're right on that extent. In fact, we were discussing that over the closure, and it's not even a case that will arise. It's what has arisen.

10

It's -- it's like I've said before, the need for the tool to be able to tell -- to at least have something in place. I feel it's very important, but that's up to the rest of the Council also.

13

But there are -- the opportunity -- because of our road system for misuse of the resource is pretty great.

14

And we're seeing that in other

15

parts of the state as well. And I know that it is a regulation. It's a regulation we have down in Cordova that you have to remove the caudal fin on subsistence-caught fish.

17

Fred was talking over the closure about down where he is on the Kenai. It's a regulation, and that way no processor will have a fish in their processing plant. They won't take the chance of having a fish in their processing plant that's missing a caudal fin on a fish because it's illegal for them and they can lose their license.

21

If the fish are unmarked, they can show up in our processing plants and nobody would be any wiser.

22

I think that's what you were

23

getting at right there.

24

Thank you.

25

Do we have any other agency comments? Eric, do you have something on this?

1  
2 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman, Eric  
3 Veach, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.  
4 Again, I'd just like to share some of the  
5 public comments that were presented at the  
6 subsistence resource public workshop, as I  
7 do that I would also like to mention I  
8 worked with Larry and his analysis.  
9 Certainly my staff recommendation is the  
10 same as Larry's, but I think it's fair to  
11 share some of these fellow comments as well.  
12 One person had mentioned that it  
13 was unlikely that subsistence users would  
14 attempt to sell a fish, the real subsistence  
15 users focus on feeding the families and they  
16 wouldn't be interested in trying to fish.  
17 Ray Sensemeyer, the chairman, also mentioned  
18 as I believe Roy mentioned earlier, it's  
19 disrespectful to mutilate the fish.  
20 And also there was kind of  
21 general sentiment among several folks there  
22 that it is a considerable burden on the  
23 users to have to remove the lobes from the  
24 fish, particularly if they're dip netting.  
25 You can't get yourself in position in the  
river to remove the fish, would you have to  
remove the fish immediately, climbing back  
on the bank, and potentially the fish has  
fished moved upstream and you've kind of  
missed your opportunity to catch fish.  
The Federal regulation is a  
little more restrictive than the State  
regulation. The State requires you to  
remove the tips of the fish; the Federal is  
the lobes. If you're removing the fish for  
drying, potentially going with the State  
regulation to remove the tips of the lobes  
would be actually less of a burden to the  
users.

21 MR. LOHSE: Am I understanding  
22 right, that currently under the Federal  
regulation you have to remove the tail fin?

23 MR. VEACH: Both lobes. If you  
24 have the work, it's the piece above the  
fork.

25 MR. LOHSE: So there's no handle  
left?

1 MR. VEACH: Right. That's a good  
2 way to describe it.

3 MR. LOHSE: But the State, you  
4 just have to take the tips off?

5 MR. VEACH: Correct.  
6 Are there any Fish & Game  
7 Advisory Committees that wish to testify?

8 MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't  
9 quite understand the difference in removal  
10 of the fin, the Federal and the State. I  
11 know the State requirement, but -- Federal I  
12 didn't understand.

13 MR. LOHSE: Basically --  
14 basically, under Federal law, you have to  
15 cut back like this (indicating) and take the  
16 whole -- take the whole caudal fin off like  
17 that, the whole lobe of the caudal fin off.  
18 Under State law all you have to do is cut  
19 the tips like this (indicating).

20 MR. EWAN: Okay.

21 MR. LOHSE: Thank you. I didn't  
22 realize that myself, that there was a  
23 difference on that. I doubt if anybody  
24 would have ever -- if the tips were cut off,  
25 I doubt anybody would ever say anything  
about the fact you didn't cut the whole fin  
off.

Okay. We have written public  
comments?

MS. WILKINSON: Yes,  
Mr. Chairman. There were two. One of them  
is from CDFU and Sue will give that.

And the other was from Don Harbor  
in Delta Junction who stated that he opposes  
this proposal. If clipping the caudal fins  
prevents overharvest by dipnetters, it's  
only logical to assume it would have the  
same effect for fishwheel operators.

MR. LOHSE: Okay. That's all the  
written comments?

1 MS. WILKINSON: (Nods head.)

2 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Ann. With  
3 that, I only have public comments. I only  
4 have two down here. If I miss somebody and  
5 you intended to comment on this, let me  
6 know. I'm looking through the things. I've  
7 got Sue and Gloria down. Sue doesn't need  
8 to comment.

9 Okay. Gloria?

10 MS. STICKWAN: We don't support  
11 cutting off the caudal tail, we don't want  
12 to do that. I think only dipnetters should  
13 have to comply with that regulation because  
14 it was written for them. We think they're  
15 the only ones who should have to do that and  
16 comply with that regulation, not qualified  
17 subsistence users.

18 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
19 Gloria?

20 Gloria, I've got a question.  
21 Some of the fishwheel users on the Upper  
22 Copper aren't -- aren't local people; and,  
23 you know, we saw yesterday that there was  
24 basically an average of almost 600 -- 600  
25 fishwheel permits. Do you -- do you feel or  
do you have any feeling that some of the  
fish that are taken from that are sold  
illegally and that clipping the caudal fin  
might be one way of keeping track of where  
those fish go?

MS. STICKWAN: Those people would  
be people from Anchorage. They wouldn't be  
qualified subsistence users.

MR. LOHSE: So, all the  
fishwheels are not Federally qualified  
subsistence users. This proposal only  
applies to Federally qualified subsistence  
users?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you. Any other  
questions of Gloria?

Thank you.  
Any other public testimony?

1           Okay. Then, in that case, a  
2           motion --

3           A SPEAKER: Sir. Am I wrong,  
4           you're asking for public testimony?

5           MS. WILKINSON: This is  
6           Mr. Bower. He needs to testify to Proposal  
7           11 after they finish this proposal.

8           MR. BOWER: I don't want to be  
9           left out. I've waited for you guys, and I  
10          definitely don't want to be left out.

11          MR. LOHSE: Okay.  
12          Okay. With that, a motion to put  
13          this proposal on the table either as staff  
14          recommends or as it's written is in order.

15          A SPEAKER: I make a motion we  
16          put this proposal as written.

17          MR. LOHSE: As written.  
18          Okay. Do I hear a second?

19          MS. SWAN: Second.

20          MR. LOHSE: It's been moved and  
21          seconded to put this proposal on the table  
22          as written.  
23          It's open for discussion.  
24          Fred?

25          MR. JOHN: I support this, but  
26          then I still have, you know, concern about  
27          fish getting caught -- I kind of like  
28          your -- what you said earlier about having  
29          just one tail fin cut, to tell between the  
30          Federal, you know, salmon and State salmon.  
31          But I, myself personally, I think there's a  
32          way we could, you know, do this without, you  
33          know, having too much from the Elders and  
34          stuff.  
35          And then another one is that we  
36          have, you know, like barter and trading.  
37          You could tell the difference between a  
38          State-caught salmon and a Federally-caught  
39          salmon. That's my concern.

40          MR. LOHSE: That's kind of one of

1 the things I was thinking of too on that,  
2 Fred, is that you would be able to tell the  
3 difference between a State subsistence  
4 salmon and a Federal subsistence salmon, one  
5 of which can be traded and one of which  
6 can't.

7 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chair, I'd like to  
8 ask Gloria again what she thinks of this,  
9 since she's -- she --

10 MR. LOHSE: Just the tip off of  
11 one.

12 Gloria, Fred would like to ask  
13 you a question.

14 MR. JOHN: Gloria, what I want to  
15 ask is what you think about just having,  
16 like we're talking about, to distinguish  
17 between the two, State caught and Federally  
18 caught, about choosing one tail fin cut  
19 Federally or the other way?

20 MS. SWAN: By the fin, you're  
21 talking about just cutting the edge off?

22 MR. LOHSE: Cutting the tip off  
23 of one tail fin instead of cutting the tip  
24 off of both of them. That way you can tell  
25 a Federal subsistence-caught fish from a  
State subsistence-caught fish. Not cut the  
whole tail fin, just the tip.

MS. SWAN: It still would be a  
hardship for our people, at least -- I don't  
know. It would still be hard to cut through  
that piece, but I guess -- we could do that.

MR. LOHSE: You could do that?  
It would only be half as hard, because you  
don't have to cut --

MS. SWAN: Also, too, the other  
parts of the fins of the fish.

MR. LOHSE: You mean the  
different fish?

MS. SWAN: Yeah, the top would be  
smaller, the top fins.



1

MR. LOHSE: The dorsal fin?

2

MS. SWAN: I don't know what they're called.

4

MR. LOHSE: The dorsal fin is the big fin on the back. The other fin is that little soft fin that's on the tail.

5

MS. SWAN: Why couldn't we cut that off? That would be easy.

7

MR. LOHSE: They mark a lot of hatchery fish by marking that. A lot of fish come with that already cut off. That and the pectoral fins, the ones that are in the front are used by the hatchery to mark the fin.

10

MS. SWAN: The fin on the bottom, when we make dry fish, we cut that off.

12

MR. LOHSE: The ventral fin --

13

MS. SWAN: This one down here. Customary and traditional, and we always cut this part off (indicating).

15

MR. LOHSE: You do?

16

MS. SWAN: We do. My mom always told me to cut that off. Whenever we cut fish, we were always told to cut that off.

18

MR. LOHSE: That's funny, because that's the first one I cut off.

19

MS. SWAN: That would be a distinction.

21

MR. LOHSE: Would that be much more acceptable?

22

MS. SWAN: That would be a distinction between Federal and State fish. We always do that.

24

MR. LOHSE: Thank you. I'd like to call Charlie back up if I could and ask

25

1 him the question. I'll put him on the spot.  
2 She's talking about the one by  
3 the belly. The one back by the tail, the  
4 one underneath.

5 MR. EWAN: I want to be sure  
6 we're talking about it. I want to know what  
7 that's called.

8 MR. LOHSE: That's called the  
9 ventral. The ventral.

10 MR. JOHN: Which one is that  
11 again? I'd like to see it.

12 MR. SWANTON: It was a joke. I  
13 said, the book that Larry is bringing  
14 around -- I just wanted it noted that it's a  
15 State sport fishing regulation book. That  
16 has the pictures.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. SWANTON: That might have  
19 something to do with why we have to put  
20 pictures for the sport fishermen for those  
21 guys to understand what we're talking about.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. LOHSE: Charlie, with what  
24 we've been talking about, if the ventral fin  
25 would be more culturally acceptable, would  
that be an acceptable marking, or is that  
one that gets removed so commonly that it  
wouldn't be an acceptable marking?

MR. SWANTON: To tell you the  
honest truth, I don't recall -- I'm not  
saying that my knowledge with regards to --  
you know, marking fish is all-encompassing.  
I don't recall the ventral fin being removed  
in any other regulations. I know for the  
marking we do relative to the population  
assessment work that a ventral fin is not a  
fin that we mark. It would be a distinct  
mark.

I think -- because I was just,  
you know, putting my sinister hat on trying  
to figure out how somebody wanting to, I

1     guess, find the gray area here, this would  
2     be a distinct mark as opposed to if you only  
3     had to clip one lobe of the dorsal fin. I  
4     could see where somebody could use that,  
5     only clip one lobe of the fin, use this  
6     regulation, say, well, I'm confused here. I  
7     clipped one lobe, say in the State -- say in  
8     the dip net fishery, and try and circumvent  
9     the whole process in that fashion. But I  
10    think that the ventral fin would be a  
11    distinct mark.

12           MR. LOHSE: There's another  
13    advantage to the ventral fin is you can  
14    remove that much easier, because you hold  
15    the fish by the tail you take a knife and  
16    the ventral fin comes off. Take the tail  
17    fin off, like Roy has testified, you've got  
18    to lay it down on something and chop or  
19    you've got to use the scissors. That would  
20    be one way to distinguish between  
21    Federally-caught subsistence fish and it  
22    would be a mark that would be culturally  
23    acceptable.

24           Do we see any problems with it?  
25    I mean off the top of your head. I'm  
26    putting you on the spot, and you don't know  
27    all of the answers, but can you see any  
28    problems with that?

29           MR. SWANTON: I have to respond  
30    and say on the surface, no.

31           MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
32    Did she have any problems with  
33    it?

34           (Laughter.)

35           MR. SWANTON: My brain, I might  
36    add. It's a woman.

37           MR. LOHSE: That's for most of  
38    us.

39           MR. SWANTON: Anybody that denies  
40    that has probably got some other problems as  
41    well.

42           (Laughter.)

1           MR. SWANTON: Some people freeze  
2 the fish in the round as it gets to the  
3 chinook salmon. I don't know how that might  
4 fit into it. On the surface, I don't really  
5 see much problem.

6           MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
7 Gloria, do you have something to  
8 add?

9           MS. STICKWAN: Cut off the  
10 ventral --

11          MR. LOHSE: It would be for all  
12 salmon caught by the Federal subsistence  
13 users.

14          MR. LOHSE: If we don't see a  
15 problem with it, that may be an answer --  
16 maybe that's what was needed to be done a  
17 long time ago is to look at what would be  
18 culturally acceptable instead of trying  
19 to -- I'm not saying that we goofed in the  
20 past, but we've done that kind of thing in  
21 the past where instead of consulting we  
22 applied. I don't see any problem, and I  
23 know, my own experience, it's a lot easier  
24 to remove a ventral fin than it is to remove  
25 a caudal fin, because a ventral fin, you can  
26 hold onto the fish to remove the ventral  
27 from the fish. You can't hold onto the fish  
28 and remove a caudal fin. You've got to set  
29 it down and do that, unless you use the  
30 scissors.

31          Okay. Any other questions for  
32 Charlie?

33          Larry, you've got something you'd  
34 like to add?

35          MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
36 common way of talking about that fin we've  
37 shown in the picture is the ventral fin, but  
38 anatomically it's called an anal fin as  
39 well. If on the river it's known as a  
40 ventral fin, we may need to put both terms  
41 in the regulations.

42          MR. EWAN: That's why I asked the  
43 name of it. That's what I knew it by.

1 MR. LOHSE: You knew it as anal  
2 fin?

3 MR. BUKLIS: Other people may  
4 know it as the ventral fin. We'll work on  
that so it's clear.

5 MR. LOHSE: You cannot only name  
6 it, but you can describe its position in the  
back of the vent, underneath the fish, in  
back of the vent, in front of the tail.

7 MR. BUKLIS: We understand your  
8 intent. We'll cover that.

9 MR. LOHSE: Charlie?

10 MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman, I  
might add that depending on how things go  
11 with regards to the permits and everything  
else, what we've done with regards to tail  
12 clipping with the dip net permits is we've  
actually described it in words as well as  
13 put a picture of what fin needs to be  
clipped. So for what it's worth --

14 MR. LOHSE: I'm sure we'll do the  
15 same thing.

Okay.  
16 Fred?

17 MR. ELVSASS: Excuse me, just  
wondering, on the Federal Fishery, if we  
18 could have it either/or, one of the tail  
fins, top or bottom, or the ventral fin. Is  
19 that -- would that cause management  
problems, because, you know, some people  
20 that want to freeze the fish in the round, I  
do that myself, I don't want to cut the fish  
21 at all. I want to freeze it whole and  
butcher it later. It preserves much better.

22 But in turn, if people want to  
use the tails and backbones to dry, our  
23 custom is to take the tip of the tail, bend  
it over a line, clothesline, or whatever,  
24 pin it there and it dries very well. And  
you don't have any of the meat of the fish  
25 then touching the line and so forth where  
moisture could spoil it.

1           So, in looking at this, instead  
2   of cutting both the tail fins, cut one of  
3   them, or the ventral fin. Would that be a  
4   management problem or -- you know, it's  
5   difficult when you look at 50 fish in a bin  
6   or in the back of a pickup.

7           But, in turn, I guess, it's  
8   difficult anyway. You have to look at each  
9   fish separately.

10          What do you guys think too?  
11          I'm specifically asking just as  
12   an idea.

13          MR. LOHSE: Larry, did you have  
14   some comment on that?

15          MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, in  
16   terms of the management implication, I think  
17   it would contribute to confusion. Secondly,  
18   the more I think about only having one lobe  
19   of the tail fin clipped, I think the problem  
20   with that as a distinguishing feature from  
21   the State side is we would be actively  
22   wanting people to only mark one. It's not  
23   kind of one or more. So, I mean, some  
24   people might want to go ahead and continue  
25   to mark both lobes when the regulation is  
26   you need to only mark one. And, in fact, we  
27   want you to stop at that point. Otherwise,  
28   you're not going to distinguish your fish,  
29   you might fall back to the custom of both  
30   lobes as currently required. You might get  
31   them to mark just the one and stop there as  
32   a distinguishing feature, which is what  
33   you're after with that request.

34          And then if you give them the  
35   allowance to mark the ventral fin or only  
36   one lobe of the tail fin, I think you have  
37   the confusion factor.

38          MR. ELVSASS: Thank you.

39          MR. LOHSE: Charlie?  
40          Well, did I see you lean forward  
41   to say something, or did Larry pretty well  
42   say it?

43          MR. SWANTON: I think I probably  
44   would concur with what Larry said. The only  
45   thing, I did have one thought. I think it

1 would be beneficial to remove the whole  
2 ventral fin if that's what you guys are  
3 contemplating, depending upon where the fish  
4 is in terms of its migratory development.  
5 You did tend to find some abrasion of the  
6 ventral fin because that's a fin that's  
7 largely in the gravel, and so that -- I  
8 think that it would probably be beneficial  
9 to remove the entire ventral fin. I mean,  
10 somewhere at the base of the body, as  
11 opposed to just clipping a section of it.

12 MR. LOHSE: I think that was the  
13 intention from Gloria's description, because  
14 I think what she's doing with the ventral  
15 fins is the same thing that I do, and  
16 basically taking a knife and cutting it  
17 right off. Am I correct, Gloria?

18 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

19 MR. LOHSE: I'd say removing the  
20 ventral fin, not clipping it. That doesn't  
21 open the fish up enough to worry about  
22 freezing it in the ground.

23 Roy, did I see you have  
24 something? You started to lean forward  
25 before.

MR. EWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I  
kind of go along with what Fred said about  
wanting to keep the salmon whole. I like  
the idea of an option. Whether that's  
possible or not, I don't know. I'm trying  
to figure out in my mind why there would be  
an objection to having that option, either  
doing the tail fin or the ventral. I like  
that idea because I also like to keep it  
whole when I'm freezing it.

And then, you know, if you're  
away from the river, to the house, like I  
am -- I'm six miles away from my fishwheel,  
maybe more, and there's a possibility flies  
will get into that area if you've got an  
open pickup. I don't like that idea. If  
you're going to freeze it, you know. Flies  
get onto it.

I don't know. That's all.

MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman?

1

MR. LOHSE: Yes, Clare.

2

3

MS. SWAN: I am particularly worried about enforcement, and I think that certainly it doesn't matter to me where you -- how everybody wants to mark the fish, but the thing is, it will be very confusing. The other thing that I know, and I guess we all know, people will do whatever they want anyway if they think nobody is looking. But as far as the -- just, you know, the nitty-gritty on the ground, so to speak, getting of the fish, so if you're down there dip netting and you get six fish, you have to bring your net up, cut your fish and go back down, and then maybe some fish swam by while you were on the riverbank cutting your fish, so -- I mean, that's not a problem, it's part of fishing. It's not going to be that easy.

12

I'm going to speak as an Elder just to get to the end of this tale. I think we talked culturally about disrespecting the fish when we do anything to it or whack its tail off or whatever before we brought it up to eat. Well, I think that -- that we have to do an adaptation here, and I think if you want to save the pieces for those Elders who wish to eat them or anyone, that's fine. But there's also when you say it's really hard to cut a fish, cut the tails off or remove the ventral fin, well, if you're an Elder, part of the culture says you get somebody to help you or do it for you. That's a real thing, you know. And for me it's easier to whack off the tail lobes because you just get -- you can buy -- you really need pruning shears, only this long, big handles and a spring, all you've got to do is whackity whack. It's done. It's harder for me as an Elder to cut an anal fin because you have to hold it to do it.

23

We're going to get down to the nitty-gritty. I'm really concerned about enforcement and confusion, what the enforcement will be.

25

Impossible, and we need to do



1 that.

Thank you.

2

MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Clare.

3 I'm going to speak as an almost Elder. I'm  
not quite there yet. I've got another year.

4 But I agree with you 100 percent.

5 One of the advantages of becoming an Elder  
or an almost Elder is the fact that you  
normally have younger people around and you  
6 can come home and you can say, "we're not  
going to go deer hunting again until those  
7 deer are skinned. Would you boys skin them  
before supper" or something to that effect.

8 That's one way that you teach the younger  
generation how to do those kind of things.

9 And I know good and well that if I was  
operating a fishwheel and there was tail  
10 fins that had to be clipped, it wouldn't be  
me that clipped them. One of the boys would  
11 be doing it.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. LOHSE: From that standpoint,  
I think you're right, Clare. Part of this  
14 is an exchange of culture and explaining to  
the younger folks to do things. If there's  
15 a job that we don't like to do or it's too  
hard for us to do, we can ask them to do it  
16 and teach them something too.

I'm afraid of confusion too. I  
17 think it should be one way or the other. I  
don't have any problem with the people of  
18 the Copper Basin clipping the ventral fin --  
is more acceptable. I don't see any problem  
19 in clipping the ventral fin. If clipping  
the tail fin is -- can be done in the easier  
20 manner, people have adapted to it in other  
places, that's okay. I do really feel that  
21 something needs to be marked, and I'll just  
let it go at that and I'll let the Council  
22 come up with an amendment to this proposal  
to mirror what they would like to see done.

23 I do think that having two  
options to do it adds a lot to the  
24 confusion. I mean, I think that it should  
be one way or the other so that -- so we  
25 have -- so we have just that much less  
chance of making mistakes and that much less

1 chance of somebody wondering what they  
should do.

2 And so, Roy or Fred or one of you  
3 guys, if you want to leave it as it is, you  
4 can leave it as it is. We can vote on it or  
5 we can add an amendment to do it the way  
6 that it's more acceptable to people in the  
7 Copper Basin.

8 MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I just  
9 want to say that I would like to make it  
10 easier on the users of subsistence even if  
11 it's a burden on the enforcement people. In  
12 my opinion, there is not that many people,  
13 agency people, coming out to check to see if  
14 we did this or that. I have fished for  
15 years now and have not had anybody come to  
16 check to see if the tail has been off yet.  
17 So, I don't think they've done it to anybody  
18 I know. But we have to do it anyway. I  
19 don't see any hardship on them because they  
20 haven't done anything to check it anyway.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. EWAN: I don't think it's  
23 that difficult to have that option myself  
24 just in my own mind. I'm thinking that why  
25 not help the Elders that have traditionally  
26 gotten rid of that, that ventral fin anyway  
27 to process the fish in our area that's a  
28 pretty common thing that you take the  
29 ventral fin off to dry the salmon.

30 But Gloria was talking about, and  
31 they used to do it, you grab it by the tail  
32 and whack it off. It's very easy. It's not  
33 the custom doing it that way. That's why I  
34 was saying that we should consider an  
35 option. I do not think that it would be  
36 very difficult just looking at the salmon to  
37 see if -- one of the fins were whacked off,  
38 one or the other.

39 MR. LOHSE: Would you like to  
40 make an amendment to that effect?

41 MR. EWAN: Yes, I move.

42 MR. LOHSE: You move that we  
43 amend this --

1 MR. EWAN: And let the Federal  
2 Board deal with it.

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay. You move to  
4 amend this to allow Federally qualified  
5 subsistence users to remove either one lobe  
6 of the caudal fin or the ventral fin?

7 MR. EWAN: Yes.

8 MR. LOHSE: Does that sound  
9 proper?

10 MR. EWAN: That's good enough for  
11 me.

12 MR. LOHSE: And we'll remove one  
13 lobe of the caudal fin so it's a definite  
14 mark.

15 MR. EWAN: I'm not really stuck  
16 on one or two.

17 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.  
18 Does that -- that's your proposal  
19 for your amendment?

20 MR. EWAN: Yes.

21 MR. LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

22 MR. JOHN: I second.

23 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved and  
24 seconded.  
25 This is for Federally qualified  
subsistence users to remove either, either  
one lobe of the caudal fin or the ventral  
fin.

Any discussion?

MR. EWAN: Question.

MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
called on the amendment. All in favor of  
the amendment, signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 MR. LOHSE: All opposed, signify  
2 by saying "nay."  
Motion carries.  
3 We now have an amended motion  
4 that says basically that you may not possess  
5 fish taken under the authorities of the  
6 Upper Copper River -- under the authority of  
7 the Upper Copper River with a Glennallen  
8 District subsistence or a Chitina District  
9 fishing permit unless one lobe of the caudal  
10 fin or the ventral fin have immediately been  
11 removed from the salmon. Only if you are  
12 using -- wait a second -- okay. That's  
13 where it stops, right?  
14 So you may not possess salmon  
15 taken under the authority of the -- under  
16 the authority of a Federal, let's put in  
17 there Upper Copper River District  
18 subsistence fishing permit unless one lobe  
19 of the caudal fin or -- unless either one  
20 lobe of the caudal fin or the ventral fin  
21 have immediately been removed from the  
22 salmon.  
23 Does that read basically what we  
24 were saying, right?  
25 Do we have anymore discussion on  
this?

16 MS. SWAN: Could you read that  
again, please?

17 MR. LOHSE: Okay. You may not  
18 possess salmon taken under the authority of  
19 a Federal Upper Copper River subsistence  
20 fishing permit unless one lobe of the caudal  
21 fin -- unless either one lobe of the caudal  
22 fin or the ventral fin -- ventral or anal  
23 fin, have immediately been removed from the  
24 salmon.  
25 Does that sound clear?  
Either and/or. So you can remove  
either the caudal fin, one lobe, or the  
ventral fin. That way, whichever is easier  
for the individual can be done. Both of  
them will be very distinctive marks, and  
they'll both be different than the State  
mark, because the State mark is just the  
tips of the caudal fin.

1           So, okay. Any other discussion?  
2           Then a question is in order.

3           MR. ELVSASS: Question.

4           MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
5           called. All in favor, signify by saying  
6           "aye."

7           COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

8           MR. LOHSE: All opposed, signify  
9           by saying "nay."

10          Motion carries.

11          So, we probably added some more  
12          confusion, but hopefully in the end it will  
13          actually work out to be something that takes  
14          away confusion when we get into customary  
15          trade and bartering.

16          Okay. At this point in time we  
17          have left Proposal 22, Larry. Would you  
18          present proposal 22?

19          MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
20          draft staff analysis for Proposal 22 can be  
21          found on page 151 of the council book, 151.  
22          Page 151.

23          This proposal for the Upper  
24          Copper River District was submitted by  
25          Copper River Native Association, CRNA. The  
26          proposal requests that fishwheel owners and  
27          permit holders no longer be required to  
28          display their names and addresses on  
29          fishwheels. Only the fishwheel registration  
30          number would need to be displayed. The  
31          proponent states that names and addresses on  
32          fishwheels was not a customary and  
33          traditional practice and that this is  
34          unnecessary regulation. Fishwheel  
35          registration information includes a list of  
36          subsistence fishing permit holders  
37          authorized to use the fishwheels. The  
38          proponent feels that this provides  
39          management agencies with sufficient  
40          information and that people on the river  
41          know who owns the fishwheels. The  
42          requirement in the Federal regulations to  
43          post the names and addresses on fishwheels  
44          was incorporated from the State regulations.  
45          Regulations also have general statewide

1 provisions requiring names and addresses to  
be posted on unattended fishing gear.  
2 Fishwheels used in other areas of the State  
such as in the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers  
3 are required to have names and addresses  
clearly displayed.

4 Enforcement officers could try to  
obtain a current listing of fishwheel owners  
5 and permit holders from the local Fish &  
Game office before going out on patrol of  
6 the fishery, but depending upon availability  
of the data, this might not always be  
7 possible.

8 Even with a permit list in hand,  
absent signs, it would not be possible for  
the enforcement officers to reliably  
9 identify fishwheel operators should there be  
a violation or some other matter requiring  
10 communication since multiple operators may  
be authorized to use a single wheel. If a  
11 fishwheel is operated by both Federally  
qualified and State qualified permit  
12 holders, the sign requirement may aid in  
enforcement if the fishery was ever  
13 restricted to Federal users only.

14 The way in which regulations were  
incorporated into our Federal regulations  
introduced lack of clarity regarding the  
15 sign requirements for fishwheel owners,  
permit holders. Also, the stipulation that  
16 the fishwheel owner is responsible for the  
fishwheel when it is in the water was left  
17 out as we brought State regulations into the  
Federal regulations.

18 The analysis recommends to oppose  
the proposal. As an informational item an  
19 administrative correction would clarify the  
existing regulations as to signs required by  
20 fishwheel owners and permit holders and make  
explicit the responsibility of fishwheel  
21 owners.

22 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
Larry?

23 Larry, I've got a couple of  
questions right now. This is just for  
24 clarification purposes. At this, point in  
time, is the permit user's name required to  
25 be on the fishwheel or the owner of the  
fishwheel's name required to be on the

1 fishwheel?

2 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, my  
3 understanding is the fishwheel registration  
4 number assigned to that piece of gear is  
5 required, and the fishwheel owner's name and  
6 address is required. If that owner allows  
7 some other permit holder to use their wheel,  
8 that permit holder is supposed to also post  
9 a sign with their name and address on the  
10 wheel.

11 So wheel, at a minimum, needs the  
12 gear number, if you will, the registration  
13 number for that unit of gear and the owner's  
14 name and address. If it's also being used  
15 by someone else that day, there should be  
16 that person's name on the wheel.

17 The owner name and address is  
18 supposed to be permanently mounted. The  
19 own -- number is something that can be  
20 removed when that owner is done.

21 MR. LOHSE: The requirement right  
22 now is the current operator's number and  
23 permit number be on the wheel also.

24 MR. BUKLIS: I don't believe  
25 there's a permit number. The owner's name  
26 and user's name and address, if there's a  
27 user other than that day, yes.

28 MR. LOHSE: If there is a  
29 violation taking place on the fishwheel and  
30 the owner's name and address was on there,  
31 and the current operator's name and address  
32 was on there, to whom would the Fish & Game  
33 apply the violation?

34 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, my  
35 understanding is the violation would be  
36 applied to the current operator using the  
37 wheel, but I -- my sense is that if there  
38 was something fundamentally wrong about the  
39 fishwheel as a piece of gear, in other  
40 words, it had too many baskets or some other  
41 problem or navigational hazard, that might  
42 default to the owner of the wheel. That's  
43 why we wanted the clause in there that the  
44 owner is responsible for the wheel when it's  
45 out in the water, ultimately, the owner has

1 some responsibility, but if it's a harvest  
2 problem for that current operator, then they  
3 are violating their permit for harvesting  
4 fish. They're taking too many or there's a  
5 wasteful practice or something else that's  
6 specific to the harvest process.

7 MR. LOHSE: Would -- this is  
8 just -- maybe I'm being a devil's advocate,  
9 but I'm going to ask a question. If the  
10 owner has a registration number for the  
11 wheel, that registration -- I mean, there's  
12 only so many wheels on the river. We have  
13 600 permits, but we don't have 600 wheels on  
14 the river, the registration number applies  
15 to the owner, right? So that can always be  
16 checked out.

17 To me, the only thing that I can  
18 see that would need a name and address would  
19 be the current operator, because if the  
20 current operator's name and address was on  
21 there, that would be for fish -- that would  
22 be for fishing violations. If the wheel was  
23 in violation, it has a registration number  
24 on it. When my boat is out fishing, I have  
25 a registration number on my boat, 12 inches  
high. They can see the registration number  
from an airplane, but I don't have my name  
and address on the boat, but I have my name  
and address on the permit. And if somebody  
else is using my boat, their name and  
address is on the permit, and if they are in  
violation, they are in violation because  
they are in violation on the permit. I'm  
not responsible as the boat owner, but I'm  
responsible if the boat is in violation as  
the boat owner because the permit number is  
registered to me.

20 And so I can see where -- I can  
21 see where instead of having the user's name  
22 and address on the wheel so somebody can  
23 come and bug the user and say, "Can I use  
24 your wheel?" just a permit number for the  
25 user -- for the owner -- I mean, instead of  
having the owner's name and address on the  
wheel, so that somebody can come to the  
owner and say, "I'd like to use your wheel,"  
because they know where they live instead of  
if you had a permit number, Fish & Game  
would always know whose wheel that was, but



1 the users -- the current operator's name and  
2 address needs to be on there because that's  
3 the person that would be responsible for any  
4 fisheries violation at that point in time.  
5 And I don't see where -- I mean,  
6 just like my boat -- the Fish & Game has no  
7 problem knowing whose boat it is by the  
8 permit number that's -- by the ADF&G that's  
9 posted in 12-inch letters on the boat. They  
10 have no problem knowing whose boats that is,  
11 and they don't require me to have my name  
12 and address on it. But they do require me  
13 to have my name and address and my  
14 identification along with my permit card for  
15 using that boat. And I would think that --  
16 I, myself, I can see -- I can see the  
17 people's reluctance to have their name and  
18 address on the fishwheel because people can  
19 come and knock on their door and say, "Could  
20 I use your fishwheel?" And if they didn't  
21 have it there, the Fish & Game still knows  
22 whose it is, but not every Tom, Dick and  
23 Harry that comes by knows who it is.  
24 If they are operating it, they  
25 should have to have an operator's name and  
address on there.  
See what I'm getting at?

MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
if that's a question of me. I understand  
what you're saying, and it would hinge on a  
good and current and accurate list of owners  
associated with fishwheel that have that  
number on them. That would take the place  
of the owner name and address sign. And so  
if the enforcement people can link that  
numbered wheel to an owner, it would serve  
the purpose of the owner name and address,  
that's right.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I think with  
the number of wheels in comparison to the  
number of fishing boats, and they use it on  
fishing boats all over the State, the number  
of wheels is pretty small.  
So, thank you, Larry. Any other  
questions for Larry?  
Fred?

MR. ELVSASS: I was just curious.

1 How big are the signs with the name and  
2 address and so forth, the owners? Do they  
3 have to have a signboard or just a paper  
4 posted?

5 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
6 Federal regulations are a little confusing  
7 as to which sign they're talking about. As  
8 I work through it the owner name and address  
9 sign needs to be permanently mounted, so a  
10 piece of paper or cardboard would probably  
11 not meet that standard, but it doesn't  
12 specify how big a sign or how big the  
13 letters need to be.

14 The operator sign does have a  
15 specification -- I'm looking for it -- 12 by  
16 12 inches in terms of the sign, and then the  
17 lettering needs to be one inch high. So  
18 there's some specifications about the  
19 operator sign, and the owner sign is a  
20 permanent sign. And so cardboard or paper  
21 would probably not meet that standard.

22 MR. ELVSASS: So, if -- if I  
23 had -- excuse me, a fishwheel, and I wanted  
24 to let you use it, you would have to paint  
25 the sign in sufficient size before you could  
operate the wheel; is that right?

MR. BUKLIS: Someone would --  
yes, between us we'd need to make a sign for  
me that had my name and address as an  
operator.

MR. ELVSASS: You can't just  
stick your permit paper on there and call it  
good.

MR. BUKLIS: That's correct. I  
can't just do that.

MR. ELVSASS: It just seems to me  
that the -- if the number, registration  
number of the fishwheel itself was  
sufficient size like in the commercial  
fishery, like I have to do, that should take  
care of the owner's obligation for  
identification, because Fish & Game needs to  
know or enforcement needs to know whose it  
is. And then in regards to the operator, it

1 just seems unusual to me that the operator  
2 needs to paint a new sign but I guess if  
3 that's customary on the river, that's -- I  
4 don't see a problem with that.

5 But in regards to the owner, I  
6 would think just the number board,  
7 registration number is sufficient.

8 Is it a problem for you, Roy?

9 MR. EWAN: No, Mr. Chairman, no,  
10 it isn't for me, but it may be for others.  
11 Somewhere in that process, I -- you know,  
12 lost track of the reasons for the name that  
13 address to the number. I think one would be  
14 sufficient, myself. I mean, the number, you  
15 can look at the number and know who the  
16 owner is. But if you had somebody else  
17 running it, maybe it would be -- should be  
18 required that the name be put on it and  
19 whatever permit number they have.

20 MR. ELVSASS: But if you let  
21 somebody else operate the fishwheel when  
22 you're through, is it a burden or any real  
23 difficulty for them to paint the sign?

24 MR. EWAN: I have no experience  
25 in the difficulty. I only have one person  
that uses my wheel, that's because he helps  
me. It's a lot of work to put in a  
fishwheel.

MR. ELVSASS: I think if you let  
me use your fishwheel, I'd be happy to paint  
the sign.

(Laughter.)

MS. SWAN: If you have your -- on  
your permit, on the fishwheel permit, do you  
have to have the names -- you do have the  
names of the other permit users? Are they  
listed also on the permit itself?

MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the  
State might be better able to speak to this  
or Park Service staff who have worked more  
closely with the permits. I don't think the  
fishing permit has any cross-referencing of

1 users and cooperators. That's an individual  
household document.

2 It's the sign on the fishwheels  
and then that registration number for the  
3 gear has an associated listing of who's  
authorized to use it back at the Fish & Game  
4 office or in the future, the Federal office,  
but no, there isn't a cross referencing of  
5 these shared users on the fishing permits.  
It's a reference to the gear number with a  
6 listing back at the office.

7 MR. LOHSE: Larry, can I ask a  
question?

8 And I may be wrong in my  
understanding, but I know that the common  
9 practice on the river is that if you've got  
a fishwheel and you've caught your fish and  
10 a friend hasn't caught his fish and he comes  
to ask to use your fishwheel, you let him  
11 use your fishwheel, and if you decide to do  
that during the middle of the season, do you  
12 have to go back and correct your original  
registration and put on the original  
13 registration that you have another operator  
of the fishwheel?

14  
15 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, yes,  
my understanding is you should amend, maybe  
by radio or telephone or some other contact,  
16 maybe not in person, but amend your list of  
authorized users, yes.

17  
18 MR. LOHSE: But I know that's not  
done, so that's why I think that the  
operator's name has to be on the fishwheel,  
19 because nobody in the middle of the season  
when their friend needs to use the fishwheel  
20 goes back and amends their original  
registration form, so, I think the fishwheel  
21 needs to be registered in the name of the  
owner, but every operator needs to have a --  
22 identification when they're operating it,  
but I can't see where the fishwheel owner  
23 has to have a name on it if he's got a  
registration number, because there's only  
24 one registration number for each fishwheel,  
right?

25  
MR. BUKLIS: That's correct.

1

MR. LOHSE: So it's registered  
just like a boat?

3

MR. BUKLIS: (Nods head.)

4

MR. LOHSE: Thank you. Any other  
questions for Larry? I'll ask Alaska  
Department of Fish & Game.

6

MR. SWANTON: Mr. Chairman, for  
the record my name is Charlie Swanton,  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game. This is  
Proposal No. 22. The State does not support  
this proposal. The proposal seeks to revise  
regulations requiring placement of names on  
fishwheels. It would require a registration  
number to be visible on the fishwheel rather  
than the name and address.

11

The requirement for fishwheel  
owner and fishwheel user nameplate on the  
fishwheels is for enforcement purposes and  
to protect the owner of the fishwheel from  
unauthorized use of the fishwheel. Since  
1998, ADF&G has requested owners to provide  
a list of authorized users to their  
fishwheels as an increase of people claiming  
to have permission to use specific  
fishwheels without authorization from the  
owner resulted in theft, trespass and  
vandalism of fishwheels. The fishwheel  
owners or fishwheel users' permit list only  
permits -- list only households that may  
fish that permit on that fishwheel, not all  
authorized users for that fishwheel.  
Requiring an owner's nameplate and a user's  
nameplate allows enforcement officers to  
quickly determine who is responsible for the  
fishwheel, and who is currently operating  
the fishwheel, and whether the individual  
operating the fishwheel has authorized use  
of that fishwheel.

22

I understand that might be a  
little bit confusing for you.

23

This proposal would not provide  
for increased opportunity for Federal users  
and does not impact subsistence fishing  
opportunity. If adopted, it would likely  
result in confusion for users and  
enforcement issues due to considerable

24

25

1 divergence between State and Federal  
2 regulations. For example, currently there  
3 are both Federally- and state-qualified  
4 subsistence users using the same fishwheel.  
5 If this proposal is adopted, state-qualified  
6 users would be required to have a nameplate  
7 while a Federally qualified user of the same  
8 fishwheel would not, and the owner, if  
9 federally-qualified would not, but a State  
10 user of the same fishwheel would. This  
11 represents a significant burden to the user.  
12 And these listings of people that are  
13 permitted to use the fishwheel is a courtesy  
14 and there are other issues associated with  
15 identification of the fishwheel that are not  
16 akin to a CFAC permit or a boat  
17 identification permit. Although we are  
18 largely in the office on weekends for  
19 various purposes, we don't carry with us the  
20 lists of who owns the fishwheel. As an  
21 example, if a fishwheel were in danger of  
22 drifting downriver and creating a  
23 navigational hazard or -- you know, for a  
24 myriad of other reasons, we need to be able  
25 to quickly identify and phone that person.  
Now, if it's an enforcement agent on a  
weekend, he can quickly identify by the name  
of the person that owns the fishwheel to  
say, "Hey, you better come and deal with  
this issue"; and I know that -- I'm going to  
speak on behalf of Ahtna and Chitina, the  
issue of identification of derelict  
fishwheels downriver on gravel bars and  
everything else is -- has been an issue that  
they've brought up to the Department in the  
past and it readily allows us to identify  
without having to search a permit listing in  
terms of who owns the -- the permit owners  
of the fishwheel.

Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Charlie.  
Any questions for Charlie?

MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, like I  
say -- said about the fins that we're  
talking about earlier, my thinking of that,  
we try to help the user. The agencies, they  
get paid to go out and do whatever they have  
to. They should have a list -- I don't

1 think Copper River is that hard. Other  
2 rivers may be hard, but in my opinion, you  
3 just -- should just about have an idea of  
4 who owns which fishwheels. We've done it  
5 for years, especially in my community, where  
6 I come from, we know where -- whose wheel it  
7 is everywhere along the -- I would say ten  
8 miles along the river.

9 I may be wrong, but it just seems  
10 to me like it's not that much of a burden to  
11 know whose wheels they are.

12 Like I said, I don't think it's  
13 necessary to have both name and number. I  
14 think if you're going to require a name,  
15 just forget the number.

16 MR. LOHSE: Charlie brought up  
17 the idea of derelict fishwheels, which I've  
18 seen floating down the river before, on  
19 river bars down there. How big of a problem  
20 is it?

21 MR. SWANTON: I can't speak  
22 directly year in and year out, but I know  
23 that -- I mean, it's come across, I guess,  
24 my desk. You know, it's usually an instance  
25 of a couple a year, but the derelict  
26 fishwheels that are in that section  
27 downriver and on gravel bars, I probably  
28 would ask someone from Ahtna and Chitina who  
29 actually has much experience about how many  
30 that might be. They've urged the State to  
31 try and take care of it and some of those  
32 fishwheels don't have an identification on  
33 them any longer, so it may be as many as a  
34 handful, maybe as many as a dozen stretched  
35 out over a wide range, but I don't have any  
36 knowledge of that.

37 Thank you, Charlie.  
38 Larry?

39 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, a  
40 couple of points to follow out these  
41 discussions. The staff analysis for the  
42 proposal that we're on does have some  
43 information about the numbers of fishwheels  
44 out on the river, because, as you said, the  
45 number of permits is larger than the number  
46 of units of gear out on the river. For the  
47 period of 1984 to 2000, so about a 16-,

1 17-year period, the number of actual wheels  
that were permitted range from 78 to 126.  
2 So, we're finding it's off. It's on the  
order of 100 wheels. And then, secondly,  
3 the issue of derelict or wheels washing up  
or not being secured properly, there was a  
4 proposal to our Federal process. It was  
Proposal No. 19 that spoke to requiring  
5 people -- requiring operators or owners to  
remove the fishwheels from public lands, not  
6 just from the water, but from public lands  
because of the poorly secured wheels washing  
7 downriver as Charlie has described.

He's described an in-season  
8 problem, but there is a concern about  
post-season wheels washing downriver.

9 That was -- that's not a proposal  
we're addressing because it's not under the  
10 Federal Subsistence Board's authority to do  
land management issues. But it is a concern  
11 about derelict wheels.

12 MR. LOHSE: I remember that  
proposal being in the book. And I was  
13 wondering how this would apply to that,  
because that's something I know Federal land  
14 managers are going to address even if we  
don't address it from the subsistence  
15 standpoint.

Charlie?

16 MR. SWANTON: Yeah, Larry is  
17 correct in that actually we've -- that  
jurisdiction or the authority is held by the  
18 Department of Natural Resources because they  
are the ones that are essentially the land  
19 managers below ordinary high water which is  
where a lot of these fishwheels are. We've  
20 tried to address that. You know, again,  
Ahtna Native Corporation have urged us in  
21 that regard. I don't know the last meeting  
that we had, I believe that Joe Hart with  
22 Ahtna was going to write a letter to the  
Commissioner with DNR to allow them -- or to  
23 essentially see if they wouldn't enforce --  
or enforce things such that the fishwheels  
24 would be actually removed from State land  
during the winter months, because on the  
25 flood plane above the bridge where there are  
a large number of fishwheels, people store



1     them from the river by pulling them up as  
2     far as they can. Spring flood and so forth.  
3     There have been a number of derelict wheels  
4     that have essentially been generated from  
5     that aspect. It is something that we are  
6     trying to work on, but we haven't gotten  
7     very far with it, I guess.

8             MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I have a  
9     question. I don't know if it's related. I  
10    think it's related, and I think it's  
11    something that maybe has been discussed in  
12    the past. I don't know, I've been away for  
13    a while.

14            It has to do with permit holders'  
15    help, how were they treated. Say, I had  
16    somebody help me bring my salmon up for me,  
17    but I wasn't present. How would you treat  
18    that person, that individual? Go down to my  
19    fishwheel and bring my salmon up there, and  
20    they've done everything that they're  
21    supposed to do with the fins, but you caught  
22    them down there. How would you treat them?

23            I'm curious about that, because  
24    both my person that helps me down at my  
25    fishwheel both have family, and we both do  
26    get help, do have somebody help us.

27            MR. SWANTON: I'm not as familiar  
28    with, you know, the listings in terms of the  
29    fishwheel permits and how they are -- you  
30    know, I know that on the dip net permits,  
31    you list household members on your actual  
32    permit, and I believe that those household  
33    members can participate in any way, shape,  
34    or form with regards to the actual fishing,  
35    but I'm not sure of how that -- maybe I'll  
36    just let my brain answer that one.

37            MS. PERRY-PLAKE: Lin  
38    Perry-Plake, Alaska Department of Fish &  
39    Game. I have worked doing enforcement for  
40    seven years in Chitina. That is a situation  
41    that comes up a lot, that is if you are the  
42    current operator of your wheel, then only  
43    you and the members of your household listed  
44    on your permit, under State regulation are  
45    allowed to be handling those fish, taking  
46    them out of the box, per se. Once they're  
47    out of the box and they've been marked

1     that's another matter. And so the situation  
2     arises, for instance, someone comes out to  
3     visit for the weekend and they go down to  
4     help you at the wheel. Unless they have  
5     their own permit for the wheel and they are  
6     currently posted as the operator under State  
7     regulation, if they were helping you take  
8     the fish out of your box, they could be  
9     cited. And so, I think you've raised a good  
10    point that probably should be addressed so  
11    that the situation doesn't continue, because  
12    it creates a hardship for many people,  
13    myself included. You know, if someone  
14    offers to go help me get fish from the  
15    wheel, I'm in the same situation. But  
16    current State regulations says only whoever  
17    is currently posted as the owner or current  
18    user/operator of the wheel, they and their  
19    household members are the only ones who can  
20    be removing fish from the wheel.

21           MR. EWAN: I can get a family  
22    member to help me?

23           MS. PERRY-PLAKE: If they're a  
24    member of the immediate family. Your permit  
25    was issued to Roy Ewan, then you listed the  
26    rest of your family that lives with you,  
27    your direct household, that's fine. Say you  
28    have your sister come by, or a nephew.  
29    They're not a member of your immediate  
30    family. They're not listed on your Permit  
31    No. 1344. Then if they were taking fish out  
32    of the box, helping you, it would be a  
33    violation. So that's a good point, Roy.  
34    Thanks.

35           MR. LOHSE: Can I ask for a  
36    clarification?

37           MS. PERRY-PLAKE: Uh-huh.

38           MR. LOHSE: Once the fish are on  
39    the box or onshore, they can help clean  
40    them. They can put them in a truck and pack  
41    them up the road. They can't actually  
42    operate the fishwheel.

43           MS. PERRY-PLAKE: Removing fish  
44    from the box is operating the fishwheel.

1     What we have said from the State, unless the  
2     fish are marked, that you can't have someone  
3     else -- say you're taking them out ten at a  
4     time in a bucket, bring them up to a table  
5     and clip the tail fins, then, yes, someone  
6     can help. If you're filleting, yes, someone  
7     can help you. The removal from the box,  
8     that's where a lot of us need help.

9             MR. LOHSE: Larry?

10            MR. BUKLIS: Question for the  
11     Department too, or comment. Isn't the  
12     intent of the regulation to protect the user  
13     from people allegedly helping by removing  
14     fish from the gear? Isn't that really the  
15     intent, not a hardship on the user, but as  
16     to protect against people, unauthorized  
17     people removing fish?

18            MS. PERRY-PLAKE: I think that  
19     it's sort of a Catch-22 where, yes, that  
20     regulation would protect me from someone  
21     else unauthorized taking fish from my wheel  
22     and enforcement wouldn't necessarily know,  
23     but it does very often create a hardship.  
24     You know, that's my personal experience.

25            And I think that it was -- it was  
26     basically done as -- to assist enforcement  
27     just trying to keep track of who was or  
28     wasn't supposed to be taking fish from the  
29     wheel.

30            MR. LOHSE: Roy?

31            MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I think  
32     this is something that really should be  
33     discussed in the future. I think there's a  
34     lot of views to that regulation right now.

35            I thank you for the answer. I  
36     didn't know that. I was kind of lost the  
37     last four years. I haven't been to several  
38     meetings, and I don't recall ever talking  
39     about this. And I was confused about that.

40            MS. PERRY-PLAKE: I think many  
41     people have been in the situation of not  
42     necessarily even knowing that maybe what  
43     they were doing was a violation and maybe  
44     being in a position of violation or not.

1 MR. EWAN: But I do have a couple  
2 more questions.

3 One is suppose you got sick. You  
4 are an Elder and you got sick. What's the  
5 solution? Let the fish rot while you're  
6 trying to get another permit for the person?

7 MS. PERRY-PLAKE: One option  
8 there, of course, again, the situation is  
9 where do you live, where's your wheel in  
10 relation to where -- in our case the State  
11 office, the option would be for someone who  
12 was going to help you to get a permit to use  
13 your wheel, and then take fish.

14 The question can arise there  
15 then, that they may be taking fish out and  
16 actually giving them to you, it counts  
17 against their permit limit. You know, there  
18 are a lot of ifs in there. That's one of  
19 the reasons why the Village Council Wheel  
20 Program, I think, has been a good thing  
21 because when it does operate as it should,  
22 then there's a wheel and everyone just comes  
23 and signs up and they use and the fish get  
24 distributed which is really the way it  
25 should be anyway.

But right now, they would have to  
get their own permit to help you.

MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't  
know if I heard that correctly. You say  
there are cases, kind of if a person was  
handling the fish or something like that?

MS. PERRY-PLAKE: It's not iffy,  
if someone is not listed on the permit and  
they're taking fish out of the box --

MR. EWAN: That's a clear  
violation?

MS. PERRY-PLAKE: That's a  
violation.

But probably, he's bringing up  
the idea of proxy. Yeah, you could, if you  
could get a doctor that would certify you  
were 70 percent disabled because of your  
illness then they could get a permit by  
proxy, take fish for you.

1 MR. EWAN: Suppose you --  
2 something real serious happens, and you  
3 didn't know what you were doing. Is there a  
4 time to get a permit? I think there's --  
thank you.

5 MR. LOHSE: Fred?

6 MR. ELVSASS: It just seems  
7 ridiculous to think that if the operator  
8 permit of the fishwheel was there that he  
9 has to get a permit for somebody to pack the  
10 fish up from the fish box. I mean, they're  
11 not violating any catch rules or anything.  
12 It's just a matter of helping getting those  
13 fish out of the box, and I know in my case  
14 when we have our king salmon fishery, I'm  
15 fishing in a float and I usually sit around  
16 my skiff BSing with some people until some  
17 young fellows come by and they bring kings  
18 up the dock to me. That's quite a chore.  
19 They have nothing to do with the fishery.  
20 And it seems as long as the permit holder is  
21 there or the fishwheel owner, there  
22 shouldn't be a problem, you know. Willing  
hands are always welcome.

23 MS. PERRY-PLAKE: I think  
24 that's -- I agree with you. I think the  
25 situation has become more and more finely  
defined with rules and regulations because  
the number of participants has increased so  
drastically, and as in so many other things  
in life, the more people you have  
participating, you know, the more young kids  
you have that want to violate and create  
problems, so the rules supposedly protect  
everyone, and they often create a hardship.  
So you might want to just avoid what the  
State's had to deal with.

MR. ELVSASS: At this time, I  
would have to agree that you wouldn't want  
people taking fish out of the box when the  
permit holder is not there. That would, in  
fact, be trespassing or it could be that  
they weren't authorized to do it. But in  
turn, when the operator or permit holder is

1     there, I think that's a bad law or  
regulation.

2             Thank you.

3             MR. LOHSE: I have -- just a  
second, Larry. I want to comment on one  
4     thing she said. I have to say I have to  
agree with Fred on that one when the permit  
5     holder is there. I understand where it  
comes from. I didn't understand it was a  
6     law. I know my boys helped a 90-year-old  
get the fish out when he was operating the  
7     wheel. Obviously from what you're saying,  
they were illegal to go out and carry a fish  
8     out of the fishwheel from somebody that  
wasn't a direct member of the family even if  
9     he's 90 years old.

           I know in commercial fishing,  
10    anybody that operates on the boat and  
touches fish has to have a commercial  
11    license and it doesn't matter -- my sons had  
to have a commercial license when they were  
12    five years old to move fish on the boat for  
me simply because that's the regulations  
13    that nobody can touch fish on the boat  
without having a license.

14            And so I'm sure that it's a  
carryover from that, but there should be  
15    some way that -- I mean, some older people  
don't have family in the immediate area to  
16    give them a hand, and you can't put -- I  
can't -- my two sons can't go and get a  
17    permit so that they can help this older man  
get his fish because they're not heads of a  
18    household. So something, I think, in the  
future has to be done on it. I'm glad you  
19    brought it to our attention. I had no idea  
they were doing anything illegal.

20            And I don't think a lot of other  
people do either.

21            MS. PERRY-POLAK: Right.

22            MR. LOHSE: You're just helping  
somebody else. They obviously have the  
23    permit. They're obviously there, and so  
you're giving them a hand.

           But it doesn't apply to what we  
24    were doing right now, but it was a good  
25    question, Roy, because I sure didn't know it

1 was there.

2 Larry, you had something you  
wanted to share with us.

3 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, thank you. It  
4 was pointed out to me in the options there  
is an area designated for a person helping  
5 the permitted fisher, in terms of your  
public booklet. It's on page 9 and it's  
6 designating another to fish for you, and it  
doesn't have a feature about medical illness  
or disability or anything like that. I  
7 won't read it all, but basically if you're  
Federally qualified to subsistence fish, you  
8 can designate another person to take fish on  
your behalf. So not to assist you, but they  
9 can actually take fish on your behalf. But  
when they're doing that, you can't take fish  
10 on your behalf at the same time. You're  
delegating or designating that person to do  
11 it, and you can only designate one person at  
a time to take fish for you, and that  
12 designated fisher must have a designated  
harvest permit. There is a stake. So you  
13 do have to get a designated harvest permit,  
but it wouldn't be coming out of their  
14 potential harvest allowance for themselves and  
their family. It would be coming out of  
15 your total. They're doing it on your  
behalf. When they're done doing it on your  
16 behalf, they can harvest and take fish on  
their behalf under their permit.

17 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So it applies  
18 to your limit?

19 MR. BUKLIS: That's correct.  
When you designate or delegate, it's  
20 applying to your limit. It's on page 9 of  
our booklet.

21 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

22 Thank you, Larry.

23 Any other questions for the folks  
on the table?

24 Okay. With that, we'll go on to  
other agencies. Does any other agency have  
a comment they'd like to make on this?

25 Eric?

1           MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman, Eric  
2           Veach, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.  
3           Again I wanted to share some of the comments  
4           that were prepared at -- one of those was  
5           the Elders really do struggle with the  
6           writing requirements and the process of  
7           making the sign, particularly folks with  
8           poorer vision have a tough time getting the  
9           name written on the sign and actually  
10          constructing the sign, and another issue was  
11          brought forward by several (Mark) folks at  
12          the workshop was that there's a real privacy  
13          issue, that they fear, at least that by  
14          posting their name and address, essentially  
15          on a public place, fishwheel in navigable  
16          water, folks with some sort of criminal  
17          intent can have access to their name and  
18          address. It's not information that they  
19          necessarily want to share.

20          And then one other point that I  
21          just kind of wanted to mention but sort of  
22          agree with Larry's analysis is that although  
23          this list is maintained by the State, it is  
24          confidential information and so a copy -- if  
25          only the numbers were posted on the  
26          fishwheel and not the names and addresses,  
27          you know, that list of the names and address  
28          that goes with the number on that fishwheel  
29          is not readily available to everyone. For  
30          example, I really can't get a copy of a  
31          complete list because that is confidential  
32          information and yet I and several of my  
33          staff spend quite a bit of time on the river  
34          during the summer. Certainly, if we see a  
35          problem with the fishwheel, we're in a  
36          position that we could communicate that  
37          information to the owner if the name is  
38          posted there.

39          That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

40          MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, with  
41          improvement in communication nowadays, it  
42          just seems like it's a lot easier for  
43          agencies to communicate and find  
44          information. The less burden you put on the  
45          user, the better for me. Just a comment. I  
46          think you can use a cell phone or something  
47          down in that area, some areas or some other  
48          type of communication to find out who owns  
49          that also. It's just not that hard. I



1 don't think it's that difficult.

2 MR. LOHSE: Eric, can I ask a  
3 question? Did the objections seem to be  
4 against the -- posting the owner's name and  
5 address on the fishwheel or was the  
6 objection to even posting the operator's --  
7 would there be a problem with just having  
8 the current operator's name and address on  
9 the fishwheel?

10 MR. VEACH: My -- was the  
11 objection to both? They didn't want their  
12 name and address displayed in any kind of a  
13 public place?

14 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Are there any  
15 Fish & Game Advisory Committees that would  
16 like to speak to this?  
17 Written public testimony, Ann?

18 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, we  
19 had one comment from CDFU.  
20 Do you want to do it?  
21 I guess we don't.

22 MR. LOHSE: No other public -- no  
23 other written public testimony. So we have  
24 Wilson Justin, and this is Proposal 22,  
25 isn't it?

MR. JUSTIN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Wilson Justin, and  
Gloria, and that looks like about it on  
this -- and Jane Nicholas. Okay.

MR. JUSTIN: Thank you again.  
The organization with Mount Sanford Tribal  
Consortium and Chitina Tribal Council most  
supports Proposal 22 in its entirety, and  
I'd like to discuss some of the underlying  
reasons why. A lot of the discussion in my  
mind is superfluous in terms of the names  
and address. I think it's a lot of privacy  
issue that is far above and beyond the  
regulatory issue. The right of privacy is a  
serious matter in my mind. If the person  
who is using the resources on the river is  
required to post their names and addresses

1 out there, that invites a lot of abuse,  
 2 particularly from animal rights activists  
 3 and other organizations that have a great  
 4 deal of conflict with the way we live and  
 5 who we are.

6 So, to me, the right of privacy  
 7 is a very serious Constitutional  
 8 consideration here far outweighing any  
 9 regulatory need and that may be enough alone  
 10 for most people to give serious  
 11 reconsideration to the issue, but I'd like  
 12 to go on a little further. There is also a  
 13 secondary issue here in regarding use and  
 14 consuming. It seems to me that the need for  
 15 names and addresses as positive by an agency  
 16 is in direct correlation to enforcement of  
 17 theft. Well, to me, posting the names and  
 18 addresses is a lot like asking a bank robber  
 19 to forward his name and address to a bank  
 20 he's going to rob. I mean, law-abiding  
 21 citizens who are accessing the resources on  
 22 the Copper River in the form of salmon are  
 23 going to be law-abiding irregardless of what  
 24 happens. I like to see the absurdity of the  
 25 regulations that are in place now when all  
 practical reason tells you that a fishwheel  
 is managed by families and by community, not  
 by individual.

1 I know that in our area, and  
 2 Chitina, there are only two wheels, one a  
 3 fishwheel run by an individual on a private  
 4 property, and the other fishwheel is a  
 5 community fishwheel run by Chichna Tribal  
 6 Council on behalf of the remaining residents  
 7 of the community. That fishwheel, too, is  
 8 on private property. The fishwheel that the  
 9 Chichna Tribal Council operates on behalf of  
 10 the community is operated with access issues  
 11 and permission to cross the land directly  
 12 given to the Village Council, but no one  
 13 else.

14 So, we run a wheel on behalf of  
 15 family and residents and Elders in the  
 16 village and surrounding areas, but the  
 17 specific -- with the specific understanding  
 18 with the landowner that we will not allow  
 19 trespassing, piracy to occur.

20 Chichna Tribal Council were to go  
 21 and have to get the names and addresses of  
 22 every user, permit holder and et cetera, it

1     defeats the entire program that we set to do  
2     at the Fish & Game meeting in 1996 which is  
3     to make the resources legally available to  
4     the users. Mr. Roy, what you want in my  
5     estimation is actually correct. The purpose  
6     of regulation is not to punish the user,  
7     it's to make it easier for the user to  
8     access the resource. If the State Fish &  
9     Game and enforcement agency say that this  
10    regulation is currently being abused, then I  
11    would say, "Well, change the regulations."  
12    Citizens who use the resources on that river  
13    are by and large law-abiding. Why are they  
14    criminals all of a sudden in the pursuit of  
15    the idea that somebody is stealing something  
16    and getting away with it? I don't buy into  
17    that kind of overall approach in any  
18    allocation of resources. It's only a  
19    resource. Our job both at the Village  
20    Council level, at the regional nonprofit  
21    level, and your level is to marry up the  
22    resource with the person who needs it, and I  
23    think that's what my primary objection --  
24    objection here or my objective here is to do  
25    that, make it as easy as possible for the  
26    needy users to get to the resources that  
27    they depend on. And to me having names and  
28    addresses is an impediment. If you want to  
29    punish somebody, go find the wrong-doer,  
30    don't find the person who is using the fish.  
31    It really creates a police state mentality.  
32    I don't know if we're going to be 100  
33    percent at Chichna in compliance with the  
34    law, but I know that the need of the people  
35    that operate the fishwheel is very great.  
36    We're compelled to break the law. We always  
37    have been.

38           Having said that, wouldn't it be  
39    a lot easier to change the law to reflect  
40    and protect the rights of the people who are  
41    law-abiding, because otherwise why do  
42    anything at all? Just sit home and look.

43           Thank you, if there are any  
44    questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

45           MR. LOHSE: Are there any  
46    questions for Wilson?

47           I have one. Wilson, well, you  
48    get an operator's permit for operating the  
49    fishwheel, not an owner's permit. When you

1 get an operator's permit, does that  
operator's permit have a number on it? Yes,  
2 and we post it on the wheel.

3 MR. LOHSE: You post the  
operator's number on the wheel?

4 MR. JUSTIN: Correct.

5 MR. LOHSE: There is both an  
6 owner's number and operator's number?

7 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, we have the  
two numbers side by side. A lot of times  
8 only one remains after a while.

9 MR. LOHSE: Because only the  
owner's number remains when nobody is  
10 operating?

11 MR. JUSTIN: To me, the names and  
addresses that's required to be displayed is  
12 always superfluous. If the intent of the  
regulation is to punish people who are  
13 illegally taking or using the resources,  
this won't do it.

14 MR. LOHSE: Wilson, can I ask you  
15 a question?

16 MR. JUSTIN: Absolutely.

17 MR. LOHSE: Have you ever been  
stopped and had a policeman check your  
18 driver's license number?

19 MR. JUSTIN: About four times.

20 MR. LOHSE: How long does it take  
them to find the information on it?

21 MR. JUSTIN: Not very long.  
22 Maybe 45 seconds.

23 MR. LOHSE: They make one phone  
24 call.

25 MR. JUSTIN: Just call.

1           MR. LOHSE: All the information,  
2           and --

3           MR. JUSTIN: I've never been  
4           charged with anything, just stopped.

5           (Laughter.)

6           MR. LOHSE: I wasn't talking  
7           about that I was talking about one of the  
8           things that also we're dealing with. As  
9           things change, as information becomes much  
10          more readily available, and things that were  
11          a problem ten years ago aren't so much of a  
12          problem today.

13          MR. JUSTIN: And that's why I  
14          made sure to mention in my remarks that I  
15          regard a lot of the opposition to this  
16          proposal as superfluous. You're talking  
17          about the space age here. You couldn't get  
18          away from being found out who you are if you  
19          tried for a hundred years. Only the guys  
20          who are illegally using the resources get  
21          away with that stuff. They don't put their  
22          names on the wheels.

23          MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

24          MR. JUSTIN: Thank you.

25          MR. LOHSE: Jane?

26          MS. NICHOLAS: My name is Jane  
27          Nicholas. I'm from Katvilla Village. I am  
28          Athabaskan. I'm here to give public  
29          testimony on Proposal 22. This regulation  
30          requires that registration number and name  
31          and address be permanently affixed and  
32          plainly visible on the fishwheel when  
33          fishwheel is in the water. With a metal  
34          plate of at least 12 inches by 12 inches  
35          wide bearing your name and address in the  
36          letters at least one inch high must be  
37          attached to each fishwheel so that the name  
38          and address are plainly visible.

39          This is another cumbersome and  
40          burdensome regulation placed upon the  
41          qualified subsistence users who use the  
42          fishwheel to fish with. Also, it is not a

1 customary and traditional method of fishing.  
The qualified subsistence user, especially  
2 the Elder, would have difficulty in  
complying with this regulation who do you  
3 not have a good writing ability or can't  
write on pieces of 12 inch wooden board.

4 Officials can enforce this  
regulation bill talking to a person to see  
5 who is using the fishwheel as is stated on  
the fishwheel permit, by number on the  
6 fishwheel at fishing site.

The State and Federal agent  
7 should have working agreement in place to  
share information to get names and addresses  
8 of fishwheel's owner.

The number of fishwheel would  
9 show who is currently running the fishwheel  
and the fishwheel permit would show if  
10 someone is using someone else's fishwheel.

Fishwheel permit can be shown to  
11 officer at fishing site to see if they own  
fishwheel or if they are using someone  
12 else's fishwheel.

Thank you for listening to me.

13  
MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Jane.  
14 Are there any questions for Jane?  
Thank you.  
15 Gloria?

16 MS. STICKWAN: Putting names and  
addresses isn't customary and traditional  
17 and is burdensome for the Federally  
qualified users, especially the Elders. The  
18 numbers on the fishwheel would show who the  
owner is. Whenever we give our permits,  
19 when they give out permits, we have the  
owner's name on the permit and on the back  
20 of it we are always told by Fish & Game to  
put down who is going to use the fishwheel  
21 so we have a list of the fishwheel's -- you  
know, what the name is, and whenever they  
22 have -- sometimes they do call me up at  
CRNA, you know. I tell them who it is and  
23 who -- I give the phone numbers too,  
sometimes.

24 You know, another way this could  
be solved is everybody gets a number,  
25 whoever's using the wheel, they would all  
get numbers and just put that number on the

1 fishwheel and temporarily -- put it on top  
2 of the other one. You would know who is  
3 using the wheel on top. If they don't want  
4 to do that, you know, even an agreement  
5 between the State and Federal to get names  
6 and addresses, you know, that way it would  
7 be kept private between Federal and State  
8 users and protect the owners. That could be  
9 done too. I think it would just be easier  
10 just to give everybody numbers.

11 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
12 Gloria?

13 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, just to  
14 clarify, then you don't object to a number  
15 being used on the fishwheel?

16 MS. STICKWAN: No, it's just -- I  
17 just -- we thought it would just be easier  
18 to have a number for identification rather  
19 than have your names and addresses.

20 MS. SWAN: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. LOHSE: Gloria, can I just  
22 ask one question?

23 Then there would be no problem to  
24 have the owner's number on the fishwheel and  
25 the operator's number on the fishwheel?

MS. STICKWAN: I think it would  
be easier for people. I think, just a piece  
of plastic too, if they don't want a  
wooden -- a number encased in plastic would  
be so much easier too, you know, for the  
operators, maybe -- a wooden board 12 inch  
by 12 inch could be for the owners and  
distinguish between owner and operators, a  
piece of plastic -- paper encased in  
plastic, attached to the wheel, that would  
be so much easier.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
One more public testimony. Anita  
Lowly?

MS. LOWLY: Ralph, I decided not

1 to do it.

2 MR. LOHSE: Okay.  
3 That's all of the public  
4 testimony.

5 A SPEAKER: Sir, I'm here to  
6 public testify --

7 MR. LOHSE: I've got your name  
8 right here. As soon as we're done with this  
9 proposal, I'll have you testify.

10 A SPEAKER: Amen.

11 MR. LOHSE: Okay. With that, we  
12 have Proposal 22 in front of us. We need a  
13 motion to put it on the table as written or  
14 as -- as recommended by the staff, whichever  
15 you would prefer.

16 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would  
17 like to move that this proposal to the --  
18 Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring this  
19 proposal to the table as written.

20 MS. SWAN: Second.

21 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved and  
22 seconded to bring this proposal to the table  
23 as written.

24 Discussion and recommendations or  
25 amendments or anything like that?

26 MR. JOHN: I'd like to say that  
27 after hearing all the testimony out there, I  
28 like -- I really don't want my name on my  
29 fishwheel or my car, not my fishwheel --  
30 another thing is I think, like I said, just  
31 the number, communication is real fast  
32 nowadays. Just using the number, you can  
33 get the number and address of who owned the  
34 fishwheel or who else used it and  
35 everything. So. I don't think the name and  
36 address is appropriate. I don't -- you  
37 know, going down the river, you see a bunch  
38 of different names on there, just envision  
39 the privacy -- invasion of privacy, I  
40 believe.



1 Thank you.

2 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So, basically,  
3 you would say a wooden plate -- wood or  
4 metal plate displayed 12 inches wide and  
5 must be attached to each fishwheel so that  
6 the registration number is plainly visible.

7 Would you like to amend it so the  
8 operator's number would also be posted like  
9 Gloria was suggesting?

10 MR. JOHN: Gloria suggested that?

11 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

12 MR. JOHN: Operator's --

13 MR. LOHSE: Not just the owner's,  
14 operator.

15 MR. JOHN: I'd like to add that  
16 to have the operator's number.

17 MR. LOHSE: The current  
18 operator's number be also posted. That's an  
19 amendment. Do I hear a second on that  
20 amendment?

21 MR. ELVSASS: Second.

22 MR. LOHSE: Seconded by Roy.  
23 It's been moved and seconded that  
24 along with the owner's registration number  
25 the current operator's permit number would  
be posted.

MR. JOHN: Question.

MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
called.

All in favor, signify by saying  
"aye."

The amendment passes. The motion  
in front of us then reads: You do not have  
to have your -- basically, I'll read the  
thing and then we can vote on that.

You may not rent, lease, or  
otherwise use your fishwheel used for  
subsistence fishing for personal gain, you  
must register your fishwheel with ADF&G,

1 your registration number must be permanently  
2 affixed and plainly visible on the fishwheel  
3 when the fishwheel is in the water. Only  
4 the current year's registration number may  
5 be affixed to the fishwheel. You must  
6 remove any other registration number from  
7 the fishwheel. You must remove the  
8 fishwheel from the water at the end of the  
9 permit period. You must operate only one  
10 fishwheel at one time. You may not set or  
11 operate a fishwheel within 75 feet of  
12 another fishwheel. No fishwheel may have  
13 more than two baskets. A wood or metal  
14 plate at least 12 inches high by 12 inches  
15 wide must be attached to each fishwheel so  
16 that this registration number is plainly  
17 visible and then the amendment we added is  
18 the current operator's permit number must  
19 also be attached to the fishwheel.

Does that sound good?

Any discussion?

Any other recommendations?

Fred?

13 MR. ELVSASS: I have one  
14 question, excuse me. On the fishwheel, Roy,  
15 do you get the same number every year?

16 MR. EWAN: No.

17 MR. ELVSASS: When you apply,  
18 they give you a different number each year?

19 MR. EWAN: That's correct, as far  
20 as I know. I might have gotten the same  
21 number. I don't recall the same number.

22 MR. ELVSASS: You'd recall if you  
23 were painting it.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. ELVSASS: Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: Okay.  
Any other discussion?

MR. JOHN: Question.

1           MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
called.

2           MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I do  
3   have a --

4           MR. LOHSE: Roy?

5           MR. EWAN: Not to -- I had a  
question, that's to define the permanently  
6   affixed sign has to be permanently affixed.  
Could I have somebody tell me their  
7   interpretation of that?

8           MR. LOHSE: Charlie, it's  
permanently affixed, screwed on, nailed on?

9           MR. SWANTON: (Nods head.)

10          MR. LOHSE: In other words, it's  
11   not just hung there?

12          MR. SWANTON: I think screwed,  
wired, nailed, you know. You can  
13   probably -- hung with plastic wires would  
be -- you know, probably would be what the  
14   enforcement would be looking for, but I  
can't speak for those guys.

15          MR. EWAN: Thank you.

16          MR. LOHSE: In other words, you  
17   can't just take it off and stick it on  
another wheel?

18          MR. SWANTON: (Nods head.) That  
19   is correct.

20          MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
Question has been called.

21          All in favor of the proposal as  
amended, signify by saying "aye."

22          COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

23          MR. LOHSE: All opposed, signify  
24   by saying "nay."  
Motion carries.

25          MR. LOHSE: Fred, can I ask you a

1 question? How long is your testimony going  
2 to take?

3 MR. BAHR: I don't know. Maybe  
4 it would be better after lunch if it's close  
5 to lunch and knowing how long you guys have  
6 been talking.

7 MR. LOHSE: It's close to lunch.  
8 We can quit now for lunch and put you first  
9 after lunch.

10 MR. BAHR: What time would that  
11 be?

12 MR. LOHSE: Take a look at what  
13 time it is now. I would say it would be  
14 1:30.

15 MR. BAHR: Hi, Fred; Hi, Fred;  
16 Hi, Roy. I'm a Fred too. Hi, Clare.

17 I look forward to having a  
18 discussion with you. Thank you.

19 (Lunch break.)

20 MR. ELVSASS: Can I have your  
21 attention, please? Our chairman, Ralph, has  
22 to go to the pharmacy. He'll be a little  
23 late coming back. He had to leave for a  
24 little bit, and he'll be right back. Fred  
25 John has to go get some more pain killers.  
He'll be back too. We're going to stand  
down a little bit until the guys come back.  
I guess we'll have some testimony coming up  
first.

Unfortunately, there's no coffee  
or tea. I don't know what to tell you.  
Enjoy the water.

MR. LOHSE: At this time, I'd  
like to call the Southcentral Regional  
Advisory Council fall meeting back in  
session.

As stated before lunch, we were  
going to allow Mr. Fred Barr to testify  
after lunch.

Fred, you do know we've already  
acted on the proposal you're testifying on,  
don't you?

1

MR. BAHR: Yeah.

2

3

MR. LOHSE: Do you think you can limit your testimony to about 15 minutes?

4

MR. BAHR: I'll try.

5

I'd like to ask Charlie Edwardsen to join me since he's been with me on this. He happens to be very knowledgeable on the Federal laws, Charlie Edwardsen, Jr, with me. First of all I'd like to thank you to allow me to testify before you, Clare. We've met before '87, you and I. Roy, you're with Alute --

9

MR. EWAN: Ahtna.

10

MR. BAHR: Poor Fred, got ten teeth missing.

11

First, I'd like to make some comments on the priority that -- let me back up a little bit first. I'm an Alaska Native, a whaler. I was also Mayor of Noorvik. I live off the land. I know how to hunt. I know how to survive in the Yakutat way. I was trained by my Elders in Barrow as well as Northwest Arctic, and I've got 20 years in the Arctic.

16

But this proposal that we submitted, it was the commercial fisherman Steve Vaneke, the Ninilchik Tribe, which is a Federally recognized tribe and has -- what I understood to be a priority, and -- as I just kind of talked with you guys, I'm trying to understand what you mean by priority.

20

What does the word mean where you have a subsistence priority? I don't seem to connect with an act that was done in 1980 and 22 years later that we don't have a priority and we still don't have a priority. Although we all talk about a priority, so, I would like to have a little discussion about what you guys that represent us Natives in the Kenai -- I now live in Ninilchik, on Cook Inlet. I commercial fished 15 years down there. I halibut fished in '65. We subsistence fished back then when nobody

25

1     cared and, Fred, you remember that, Clare,  
2     don't you remember before 1960s, before the  
3     massive influx of America had really hurt  
4     our resources. But back to the question of  
5     priority, what does that word mean to you  
6     guys? Ralph, maybe you can answer for the  
7     Chair. Your definition of priority may be  
8     different from mine.

9             MR. LOHSE: I don't know if this  
10     is what we expected. We expected you to  
11     testify on what we should have done on 11(b)  
12     or 11(a), whichever ones you're dealing  
13     with. Priority, to me, in times of  
14     shortage, the priority is in the order of  
15     who has the first priority, first use of the  
16     game or fish.

17            MR. BAHR: Priority means first?

18            MR. LOHSE: Right.

19            MR. BAHR: So, in this essence  
20     when I look at this map back onto that --  
21     how about you, Roy, what's your view of  
22     priority?

23            MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I think  
24     Ralph adequately described what priority is  
25     all about, and that's in time of, I guess,  
26     shortage, you give the subsistence user a  
27     priority. That is my definition of priority  
28     under ANILCA. You are provided by law to  
29     give priority to the subsistence user.

30            MR. BAHR: All right. So that  
31     only kicks in --

32            MR. EWAN: That doesn't apply --  
33     the State does it a little different. You  
34     know that.

35            MR. BAHR: I understand the State  
36     was removed from the subsistence issue by a  
37     Federal court order because of their lack of  
38     abiding by what the subsistence issue was;  
39     is that correct?

40            MR. EWAN: I don't know if I  
41     understand you're correct.

1 MR. BAHR: That the 9th Circuit  
2 removed the State from management of  
3 subsistence users for Natives because they  
4 refused to give us our subsistence priority;  
5 is that correct?

6 MR. EWAN: You're asking me?

7 MR. BAHR: I'm talking to you,  
8 Roy. I'll ask everybody -- you all  
9 represent the same Board to me.

10 MR. EWAN: I don't know  
11 specifically that way, but that is one of  
12 the reasons, yes.

13 MR. BAHR: What I'm trying to get  
14 is a base ground here to where I can give my  
15 views of what you should have done with my  
16 proposal and the rest of them, Ralph, and  
17 understanding -- of course, I do understand  
18 the resource, the tremendous impact on the  
19 resource of fish in Cook Inlet. I don't  
20 think any of you can argue that it's a half  
21 a billion dollar industry now, and when I  
22 looked at the map -- and I came to your  
23 subsistence office -- if any of you guys  
24 have this map, maybe you can follow me.

25 On this map is -- everything in  
white is State and the Federal Board signed  
an agreement with the State that now the  
State Government has removed the State's  
contention that this -- that they remove the  
subsistence users from Cook Inlet, and I'm  
talking specifically about Cook Inlet. I'm  
not talking about the North Slope or  
Northwest Arctic. We don't have this kind  
of --

MR. LOHSE: Could you speak to  
the Chair, please?

MR. BAHR: I see a lot of my  
friends here.

What I have found is that you  
have effectively moved the purpose of that  
law of giving Natives priority in Cook Inlet  
by this illegal agreement with the State --  
I know it's not up to you guys. I just want

1 to bring it up to you because, in essence,  
2 none of us are in the law without that first  
3 priority in place; is that correct? Because  
4 of the commanding statute of ANILCA and  
5 there's a bunch of others -- I even have the  
6 international laws that the Congress passed  
7 for the U.S. about the rights of  
8 subsistence, our right to do subsistence.  
9 So what I'm looking at here is it took me  
10 two years to get on your agenda after we  
11 submitted, following your rules; and it was  
12 stopped because of the Sierra Club and  
13 Sports Fisheries Association out of Coopers  
14 Landing stopped my priority for subsistence.  
15 And then at the time, in your  
16 regs at that time said subsistence didn't  
17 include salmon, halibut, trout, everything  
18 that we as Natives know -- you know, you  
19 know. And, Clare, I'm not sure about you,  
20 but you know that we live off our fish and  
21 our moose and the animals traditionally. I  
22 don't think there's a question on that one,  
23 is there?

24 MR. LOHSE: As far as -- remember  
25 one thing, ANILCA doesn't apply just to  
Natives. It applies to rural residents,  
Native and non-Native in the State of  
Alaska.

MR. BAHR: I'm recognizing that  
under ANILCA. We still don't have the  
priority. Whether Native or non-Native. We  
have not be given a priority since 1980  
since the act was invoked and passed by  
Congress. I'm upset about that because I'm  
coming to you two years after I submitted a  
proposal to go subsistence fishing and  
hunting. It's still -- although I agree  
with part of what you've done here, you have  
included these fish that astounded us that  
didn't come up under subsistence. They do  
in Arctic, but they don't do it where a half  
a billion dollars is made by America.

We as Natives are left out of  
them. Fish other than them is crossed out.  
I appreciate that move with your guys. With  
the understanding as we do on subsistence  
and the priority, it's also astounded me  
when I think about it, that sports fishing



1 lodge, tourists were given a priority over  
2 Alaska Natives and now in Cook Inlet it's  
3 unfortunate that 1100 halibut fishery  
4 charters hate Alaska Natives and they're  
5 very blunt about it because we are their  
6 fare that they're going to get booked out.

7 On the other hand, when I look at  
8 what you've done, subsistence priority is on  
9 the back burner, has been.

10 The agreement with the State and  
11 Fish & Game when Governor Knowles was their  
12 Commander in Chief comes up to Noorvik and  
13 tells us we are going to support 100 percent  
14 subsistence, and then as I move back down to  
15 Cook Inlet and find out that the subsistence  
16 issue has been totally shelved by this  
17 agreement where you have all these tribes,  
18 including yours, Fred, and Clare Swan, are  
19 actually unallowed to do any subsistence  
20 fishing.

21 The aboriginal rights of Alaska  
22 Natives preclude ANILCA, and I don't think  
23 there's going to be a lot of problem with  
24 that in court because of our aboriginal  
25 rights; but on the other hand, when I look  
26 at what you as an Advisory Board, if it was  
27 the priority for Native subsistence, the  
28 language in here would be to invoke this  
29 subsistence for the Natives first and get on  
30 that; and instead of -- instead of --  
31 supporting a full-fledged subsistence  
32 priority, fishing is the priority that we as  
33 Natives see because of -- and I don't think  
34 you can question this either when you look  
35 at the king salmon run in Cook Inlet. You  
36 look at the king runs; you look at the  
37 silver runs; you look at the herring runs;  
38 they're all depleted. I see it as a person  
39 of -- that lives off the land and  
40 understands it and was there back in the  
41 '60s when we used to have six, seven, eight  
42 million runs. We used to have 250,000  
43 kings. Now we're down to 20,000 and you  
44 don't see them anymore. You see rivers  
45 empty. And so, I don't know if the priority  
46 kicks into place after the fish are gone  
47 which seems to be -- and I'm talking the  
48 sports fishing lodges all over Kenai and  
49 they've had a bad year and haven't caught  
50 fish, are losing business because they're

1 not there.

2 And so when you look at the --  
3 whether you guys should stand up strong and  
4 invoke the priority because when you look at  
5 Fish & Game and ask them -- excuse me, let  
6 me just click this off.

7 When you look at the effect of  
8 what you've done or lack of doing, in fact,  
9 Fish & Game, there's seven or eleven species  
10 of salmon that are extinct now because of  
11 management of Fish & Game. The moose  
12 population also is another issue down there,  
13 the Niniilchik Tribe, the Fish & Game, the  
14 Federals are actually trying to manage their  
15 own moose population because it hasn't been  
16 supported by Fish & Game. I'm not here to  
17 beat up on Fish & Game or you guys. I'm  
18 here to tell you that we as Natives have  
19 been mishandled, misused or abused by your  
20 Board and the Supreme Board, I guess,  
21 although you guys don't hold any legal  
22 standing in corporate, as I do, as an  
23 aboriginal Native. I have legal rights to go  
24 to Federal Court to stand up for my  
25 subsistence, and I'm going to do that.  
Black robe justice isn't my idea of how we  
as Alaskans should work together. I'm here  
to explain that there are those of us who  
understand the law we have been abused by  
who you chose to work with -- I haven't  
received one bit of paper from you. When I  
got -- DEC, I got millions of dollars as a  
grant writer. When I deal with other  
people, I get a call or piece of paper or  
communication. In this case, there was  
absolutely nothing.

19 There was -- when I look at our  
20 people, in fact, Kenaitzes when we're down  
21 there, I'm the one that did the eagle  
22 paperwork that we did for subsistence  
23 fishing we did in '87 and we were totally  
24 cloaked in Federal law and Federal permits  
25 and Federal I.D.s and Federal conservation,  
and when they came to stop us and I think,  
Clare, you were there and turned down the  
subsistence battle. In fact, you got quite  
irate. Then I found out you were a  
commercial fisherman making a half a million  
a year, I can understand it. At the same  
time I looked at your tribe and the Indians

1 and Natives down in Cook Inlet. They're the  
2 poorest people on the block. Subsistence is  
3 a real issue. It's not just a feed of  
4 salmon or two. What I'm looking for, Ralph,  
5 your actions or inactions have caused real  
6 harm to people. I'm talking about Alaska  
7 Natives because of the priority -- the  
8 priority is not the priority politically.  
9 The priority politically is to keep us out  
10 so that the sport fishing and the \$200 Fish  
11 & Game gets from a king tag and a halibut  
12 tag continues.

13 MR. LOHSE: Fred?

14 MR. BAHR: What I look at -- what  
15 I would like you guys to do with this  
16 proposal and be honest with us and stand  
17 behind it 100 percent, say we demand that  
18 you guys give these guys subsistence  
19 priority and we'll sit down if you -- with  
20 you and come up with a plan together, as we  
21 should as Alaskans, as first Alaskans. You  
22 may have been here 40 years. Those that  
23 have been here 40 years, love Alaskan  
24 Natives. They lived off the land back  
25 there. These newcomers that are coming here  
for the money, by golly, if you wore my  
skin, wore my shoes, you'd see it yourself.  
It didn't surprise me when I heard the folks  
in Copper Center didn't want to get the  
names on the fishwheels because they might  
get attacked, kind of gives you the  
impression, because of this lack of inaction  
and indefinite rules and -- that is required  
to protect our rights, we're leaving it up  
to a Federal management board made up of  
everyone using the resources. It makes it  
when I look at what I'm talking to, but the  
Federal Board, in essence, that we are  
not -- we are not the priority.

26 MR. LOHSE: Fred, first of all,  
27 who you're talking to, you're not talking to  
28 anybody that makes any rules. You're not  
29 talking to anybody that sends out any  
30 papers. You're talking to individual  
31 citizens who are an Advisory Council. We  
are not an Advisory Board. We deal with

1 things that are put on our plate. We deal  
2 with them the best that we can deal with  
3 them.

4 Now, you came to testify on 11(a)  
5 and 11(b). And all of the rest of it. Now  
6 you have to be real careful what you're  
7 doing, what you're doing in some cases, you  
8 attacked members of our Council that are  
9 sitting up here. You've attacked staff.  
10 You've attacked the general public. What we  
11 want is we want testimony on 11(a) and  
12 11(b). Tell us what you thought we should  
13 do. Tell us how you think we should have  
14 handled it, and stick to that because, you  
15 know, I don't mind -- I've listened to a lot  
16 of rhetoric. I've listened to a lot of  
17 things in the past, but I don't like it when  
18 you attack a member of my Council. I don't  
19 like it when you attack my staff who don't  
20 belong to me, but who work hard for us, and  
21 if you want to do what you're doing, the  
22 persons you need to go talk to is you need  
23 to go talk to the Board who makes the  
24 regulations, who makes the laws. We don't  
25 make regulations. We don't make laws. What  
26 we do is we take the proposals that are in  
27 front of us and as a group we try to see how  
28 can we work these so that they meet the  
29 needs of rural Alaskans to the best of our  
30 ability within the conservation concerns and  
31 the other concerns that are around us, and  
32 we don't need to take, you know, this kind  
33 of stuff.

34 If you want to speak to this  
35 proposal and not speak to or against members  
36 of the Council, you may speak to this  
37 proposal. If you haven't got anymore to say  
38 on the proposal, I'd appreciate it if you  
39 sit down.

40 MR. BAHR: Now, I do. Although I  
41 understand -- I commend you for protecting  
42 your friends there. I'm talking facts. I'm  
43 not protecting anyone; I'm talking facts.

44 Okay. Let's get to the proposal.

45 MR. LOHSE: 11(a).

46 MR. BAHR: I was very frustrated  
47 because of the two years I had to wait

1     because of the people that are not  
subistence.

2             Let's talk about the facts. When  
you look at this here, I don't see -- I  
3     don't really see implication time or I don't  
see that this is a priority, should be a  
4     priority here to give this one support. I  
guess you just give your voice support to  
5     the Federal Board and then the Federal Board  
takes it one way or the other.  
6

7             MR. LOHSE: That's right.

8             MR. BAHR: Because of your middle  
of the ground approach to this, then -- then  
9     you just come here and make all this paper  
and then submit it to them and you're stuck  
10    with it. Is that correct? Is that what  
you're telling me?  
11

12            MR. LOHSE: We're not stuck with  
it. What we have to do is we deal with the  
paper that comes before us. We take a look  
13    at the proposal that's put on the table and  
we try to work to meet the priority to the  
14    best that we can do inside of what's given  
us, inside the information that's given us.

15            Now, what information do you  
think that you can add to 11(a) or 11(b)  
16    that would cause us to reconsider the action  
that we did on 11(a) or 11(b)?  
17

18            MR. BAHR: What I would suggest  
is you put a strong letter with it of  
support that this needs to be dealt with and  
19    implemented immediately. That you also put  
a strong letter of communication with us  
20    down there in Ninilchik so that we can start  
the process, because you need a conservation  
21    plan, and how we're going to take our  
subsistence priority into full use. I think  
22    you need to put in here something to the  
effect that it is noted that the fish quotas  
23    and the fish that are coming in the Cook  
Inlet are now depleted and that the first  
24    priority should be instituted.

25            So those are specific things that  
I don't see in here and maybe you're not  
aware of it and Fish & Game can come and

1 talk about that. But those are two of the  
2 three things that I would like you to put in  
here.

3 MR. LOHSE: Could you read your  
4 proposal to me once?

5 MR. BAHR: The one I have here is  
6 11(a), 14 executive summary. Is that the  
one we're talking about?

7 MR. LOHSE: Read your proposal as  
8 you put it in.

9 MR. BAHR: I don't have my  
proposal that I put in.

10 My proposal was to give all the  
11 fish that we subsisted on and use first  
priority to go get them to feed and clothe  
my family. That was my proposal.

12 MR. LOHSE: How did it read?  
13

14 MR. BAHR: Back two years ago,  
simple, I want all the fish available, not  
15 excluding the salmon that you guys excluded  
in that release, and now you've changed it  
16 which I'm real happy about, but I would like  
to have added on to this. The way you've  
17 written this, is those that are addendums of  
declaring that Cook Inlet is a depleted  
18 fishery.

19 MR. LOHSE: That's not in our  
20 position to do that.

21 MR. BAHR: Then what good are  
you?

22 MR. LOHSE: That's a good  
23 question.

24 MR. BAHR: I'm serious. When you  
25 took this job, what was -- that's not my  
business. My business is to get this  
proposal instituted and implemented under

1 the first priority with a depleted fish  
that's going on. I'm not here to try to  
2 hide that fact from everybody because I live  
there. I see it. You talk to the  
3 commercial fishermen on the other end. They  
didn't catch no fish either. They all went  
4 broke.

So, what we have here is the late  
5 run trying to get you guys to support us to  
call it a depleted fishery. I don't  
6 think --

7 MR. LOHSE: The proposal didn't  
ask us to call it a depleted fishery.

8 MR. BAHR: Right, but it did ask  
9 you for subsistence. I'm asking you to do  
that in person now.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: But that's not what  
we dealt with.

12

MR. BAHR: That's not what you  
13 can do?

14

MR. LOHSE: That's not what we  
15 dealt with. We dealt with the proposal as  
it sat in front of us. For you to come and  
16 ask us to do something else, and at the same  
time say we didn't do our job, what good are  
17 we -- we dealt with what you put in front of  
us, and we dealt with it to the best of our  
18 ability.

Now, if you've got something that  
19 you can tell us to cause us to change what  
we did, I'll give you five minutes.

20

MR. BAHR: I'll try again.

21 First the priority institutes  
when there's a depleted fishery, right?

22 Am I right, Roy? Isn't that what  
you just said?

23 When the depleted fishery hits,  
the first priority hits, all right.

24 I'm really thankful, Ralph. I'm  
not mad at anything here. I am stating my  
25 mind. I have a right to do that, but I  
really do appreciate you putting in the fish

1 in Cook Inlet that we are now allowed to  
attach what we asked for for subsistence.

2 What I do ask and very clearly  
that you -- what you've done here, take it  
3 one step further, and ask the Federal Board  
to institute this immediately so that we as  
4 Natives are allowed to subsist in Cook Inlet  
because we're not allowed to now.

5 Basically, that's the whole  
premise of my discussion with you, Ralph,  
6 and Roy, or Fred. Clare, sorry about Fred's  
teeth, but when I look at it, those -- that  
7 is what needs to be instituted now to  
fulfill the law so that the priority is  
8 recognized, not talking about -- not  
rhetoric, not -- it's been -- we've heard it  
9 like you, Ralph, for 20 years, so, I would  
request that you add that, that this is a  
10 depleted fishery and that the first priority  
for Ninilchik residents and Ninilchik have  
11 that first priority for subsistence and we  
move down the road together, so we can  
12 implement it together. We're all down the  
road. It's a failure. I'm sorry that  
13 you're the first one I talked to. I'll try  
to get to the Federal Board, but you  
14 represent subsistence to me, this Regional  
Advisory Board for Central. That's why I'm  
15 here. Whether it comes on the paper  
shuffle, I'm talking about real people  
16 needing real fish, needing to feed their  
families and clothing them and needing their  
17 first priority, okay?

18 MR. LOHSE: So, your statement is  
that the fish are depleted?

19 MR. BAHR: Absolutely.  
20

21 MR. LOHSE: That needs to be put  
on the agenda -- I can't take your word --

22 MR. BAHR: Absolutely not. I  
23 live there and fish there every day and see  
it, okay?  
24

25 MR. LOHSE: That's --



1           MR. BAHR: I'm on the spot. I  
live on Cook Inlet. I watch the runs. I  
2    have commercial fishermen. I have sport  
fishing lodges, and I have the guides. They  
3    all say the same thing, whether you can take  
it from me or not.

4  
5           MR. LOHSE: May I make a  
suggestion?

6           MR. BAHR: Yes.

7  
8           MR. LOHSE: Put a proposal or  
statement in that you wish to have the runs  
declared depleted and get that before the  
9    Subsistence Board so they can act on that.  
We can't do that, but you can do that.

10          MR. BAHR: As an Advisory Board.

11          MR. LOHSE: Can you add the other  
addendums? There's no public notice.  
12    They're not on the table, so put them on the  
table.

13  
14          MR. BAHR: Can I ask you one more  
small question?

15          MR. LOHSE: Yes.

16          MR. BAHR: What is a depleted  
fishery for you guys that deal in fishery  
17    business?

18          MR. LOHSE: I don't deal in the  
fishery business that way. I am not capable  
19    of making a judgment on whether a fishery is  
depleted or not.

20  
21          MR. BAHR: No information comes  
to you from anybody, I'm the first one?

22  
23          MR. LOHSE: Ann?

24          MS. WILKINSON: I was going to  
suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is  
information you can get from staff. And  
25    that he should do so now. Not the table,  
but with staff later.

1           MR. LOHSE: I mean, I'm not  
2   capable of sitting here at this table today  
3   and saying, yes, we're going to write a  
4   letter because the fishery is depleted  
5   because you said so.

6           MR. BAHR: All right. Then let's  
7   rephrase that and ask that you look into it  
8   and when you do get confirmation from the  
9   rightful sources then I ask you to please  
10   let me know. How is that? Ask that maybe  
11   you make a few phone calls with all these  
12   people you deal with, that I don't deal  
13   with. You are who I come to for  
14   subsistence. Now, looking at it from having  
15   been there off and on for 50 years, whether  
16   you take mine or not, but at the same time,  
17   I don't think it's a real issue that I'm way  
18   off base on, but at the same time I would  
19   ask that maybe you look into it.

20          I'll definitely send a proposal  
21   to Federal Fish & Game. I do ask and I  
22   thank you for the changes that you've made  
23   here to allow us to at least go after those  
24   fish, whether we will get to is determined  
25   before nobody gets them is a question that  
26   is between my mind, because it's taken you  
27   22 -- not you, Ralph, but the government and  
28   the different agencies in charge of this, 22  
29   years and still haven't done it.

30          Basically, that's the bottom line  
31   here when I look at it.

32          And I know we're all Alaskans,  
33   and that we're all in this together, and I  
34   really hope that down the road that we  
35   are -- and you guys are sitting here will  
36   stand up and be counted for what's the  
37   truth, the reality of the fisheries, and the  
38   damage that we can correct together, and  
39   work together.

40          It's either that or black robe  
41   justice, and you know how that goes. It's  
42   ugly.

43          With that, I'll take your advice  
44   and submit that proposal, Ralph. And don't  
45   feel that I'm antagonistic and attacking.  
46   I'm referring to actual facts, and facts  
47   sometimes go either way.

48          So, with that I appreciate your  
49   time and you haven't heard the last of me

1     because my people are hurting very bad, and  
the sport fisheries are hurting, the  
2     commercial fisheries are hurting, and it's  
because nobody stands up and says, by God,  
3     we've got to stop this or my kids or my  
grandkids aren't going to see any fish.  
4     That's how serious it is. At the same time  
I ask for your support because you do  
5     represent subsistence fisheries for the  
Natives, and I see Natives sitting here that  
6     you guys stand up for what's right and get  
behind what the priority really means.

7             With that, I thank you and I  
will, Ann, get back with you, and with that  
8     thank you for your time.

9             MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
Do you have something you'd like  
10    to say?

11            MR. EDWARDSSEN: I'd like to add  
to that area beyond the three miles to the  
12    200-mile zone, okay. A lot of our people --  
are pelagic people, you know, and so their  
13    subsistence access to the black cod is not  
just within the three-mile limit, and we  
14    need subsistence protection on all of the  
species beyond the three miles for priority  
15    allocation as well, and one should not be  
blind.

16            MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
17            Okay. With that, we finished our  
proposals and we are going on to the review  
18    of proposed fishery monitoring projects for  
fiscal year 2002. Tab F in your book.  
19            Everybody got Tab F?

20            MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman?

21            MR. LOHSE: Yes.

22            MR. MCBRIDE: Just while we're  
23    waiting, actually it's Tab E in the book,  
but the presentation is going to cover some  
24    material that's not in the book, and this  
morning I placed several reference materials  
25    on the back table, so it might be helpful  
there for just a minute if people want to

1 get them and the Board members have all of  
2 them. If you want, I'll go through exactly  
3 what they'll be looking at.

4 MR. LOHSE: Everybody ready?  
5 Okay.

6 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman,  
7 members of the Council, my name is Doug  
8 McBride. I'm with the Office of Subsistence  
9 Management Fishery Information Services, and  
10 what we're going to be discussing next is  
11 the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program.  
12 That's the program where we're collecting  
13 information to supplement existing  
14 information for management of subsistence  
15 fisheries. I actually have two  
16 presentations that I'm going to be giving  
17 you today, and as I say, there are some  
18 additional materials that are not in your  
19 book. The first presentation which will  
20 take no more than ten minutes, then we can  
21 discuss the contents of that, is on the  
22 fishery resource monitoring program and it's  
23 the progress report for the program that has  
24 already been funded. What I'll be directly  
25 speaking to is this handout that's entitled,  
26 Progress Report for Cook Inlet/Gulf of  
27 Alaska Region, and these are simply talking  
28 points for my presentation and is reference  
29 material for your perusal. Either now or  
30 later are these two documents. The green  
31 one is on the Cook Inlet/Gulf of Alaska  
32 Region. It contains an executive summary,  
33 an individual summary of the existing  
34 program, and then this blue document is on  
35 the inter-regional program. I'm not going  
36 to talk about the inter-regional program in  
37 my presentation. That's simply for your  
38 reference. If you have questions about it,  
39 I'm available to answer those. What I'm  
40 speaking to you about right now are simply  
41 the talking points of this handout that's  
42 titled Progress Report for Cook Inlet/Gulf  
43 of Alaska Region.  
44 Again, the purpose of this part  
45 of the presentation is to report on  
46 progress, projects that were funded in each  
47 of the last two years, in fiscal years 2000

1 and 2001. It's going to present the  
information summarized in this green  
2 document. It's not in the Council book.  
And the reason it's not in the Council book  
3 is because a lot of this work is actually --  
some of these projects are actually  
4 happening as we speak; and for that reason,  
it simply wasn't possible to make a  
5 production possible of this book.

The agenda for the next several  
6 minutes -- first of all, I'm going to give  
you a brief background on the Fisheries  
7 Monitoring Program. We'll briefly review  
the issues and information needs as they've  
8 been defined by both the Council and the  
Board for this region. Then we'll go  
9 through the Fishery Resource Monitoring  
Program for this region, the projects that  
10 have actually been funded and where we're at  
on those, and following this presentation  
11 and discussion, I'll make a presentation on  
the recommendations for the new work in the  
12 year 2000.

As far as backgrounds for the  
13 Fishery Resources Monitoring Program, again,  
the entire objective of this program is to  
14 gather and improve upon the essential  
information needed to manage subsistence  
15 fisheries. As far as the financial end of  
things on the statewide basis, the Fishery  
16 Resource Monitoring Program was initiated in  
the year 2000 and approximately \$2 million  
17 were put into the field for projects that  
first year, and you need to remember from  
18 discussions we had in the past when we  
implement programs we allow up to three  
19 years or funding up to three years of a  
project. So, out of that first year 2000  
20 program, the total of \$4 million will  
actually be spent; 2 million in the first  
21 year and then the remaining 2 million over  
the next two years.

22 Then if you remember last  
February, we had a special meeting when all  
23 the Councils came into Anchorage and we  
discussed the year 2001 projects, and that  
24 was a much larger program, and that's what's  
envisioned as the full program, a little  
25 over \$7 million was allocated to start that  
program, and those were projects that were

1 just started this year. Again a lot of  
2 those projects will go out three years in  
duration.

3 If you go to the fourth page in  
the handout, you'll see a graph, a bar graph  
4 that looks like this, and this is just a  
visual representation of what I talked  
5 about; and, again, this is on a statewide  
basis. I don't know about you, but for me,  
6 I deal with pictures better than I deal with  
words. All we're trying to get across here  
is the financial end of the program. So if  
7 you look at this bar graph, the first thing  
you'll see are the three lower -- these real  
8 dark bars in each of the first three years  
and these are years going across the bottom.  
9 In year 2000, the \$2 million I talked about,  
that's the first black bar and then the  
10 commitments for that program are those black  
bars in each of the next two subsequent  
11 years.

12 Then if you go to the second bar,  
year 2001, you see the whole bar jumps way  
up. The reason for that is because there  
13 was the commitments from year 2000 which is  
at the very bottom part of that bar there,  
14 and then the \$7 million that we allocated  
last year statewide, that's what that is.

15 And then the commitments from that \$7  
million program, 2001, that's the same gray  
16 bar in each of the two following years.

17 So, we are coming up now on year  
2002 and we're talking about new work, and  
we have \$7 million, plus the very tail end  
18 of the money from year 2000, okay, but we  
have a commitment from last year, that's  
19 what this gray part is, and so in that bar,  
the next piece up has a number in it, and  
20 that number is 2 comma 064. That means  
\$2,064,000. That's how much money is  
21 available for new work in 2002 statewide.

I'm going to end up giving you  
22 recommendations that will follow -- you see  
those numbers in each of the next two years  
23 after that. That's what those -- that's  
what those parts of the bar are. But this  
24 part of the presentation is about the  
program that's already been funded, so it's  
25 these black bars plus the gray bars, okay?

Again, for this reason.

1 Mr. Chairman, is that --

2 MR. LOHSE: What are the bars  
3 above the numbers? Are those just -- those  
4 aren't committed? Those are hoped for or  
5 something like that?

6 MR. MCBRIDE: Well, if you look  
7 at year 2002, the bar above the number, what  
8 that actually is, that's partnership  
9 program, Fishery Partnership Program, and I  
10 believe Steve Klein and Carl Jack will be  
11 speaking on that later in your agenda, and  
12 then the rest of that is -- are commitments  
13 that are likely to come up or the amount of  
14 money for 2003, and then this large clear  
15 bar here is what we anticipate for new work  
16 in 2004.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

12 MR. MCBRIDE: It's basically a  
13 visual representation of the accounting  
14 system that's going on.

15 Also, before I get into reporting  
16 on the progress, I wanted to just briefly  
17 cover how the Fishery Resource Monitoring  
18 Program is administered. The Fisheries  
19 Information Services, which, again, is a  
20 shop within the offices of subsistence  
21 management and provides the oversight for  
22 this program. The FIS staff provides  
23 assistance during both project planning and  
24 implementation, and the report of progress  
25 that I'm going to give you when we wrote all  
the cooperative agreements with all the  
contractors from the program, we stipulated  
progress records that were due on September  
1 of this year. So, again, that speaks to  
why we were unable to put that progress  
report in this book. It just didn't work  
out with the production schedule and the  
timing of this meeting.

23 The next thing I just very  
24 briefly want to touch on are the issues and  
25 information needs that you in large part  
helped to define for this region. The  
handout I'm talking about is the one that  
looks like this, this is one that we've

1 discussed before. The issues and  
information needs for this region are  
2 defined by both the Council and the Federal  
Board, and in the past, the issues that you  
3 have identified, they're fourfold issues  
surrounding the Kenai River, issues  
4 surrounding improving salmon assessment of  
the Copper, in Prince William Sound, issues  
5 surrounding improving capacity building  
among the Copper River communities, finally  
6 improving and understanding burbot and  
steelhead in the river. Those are things  
7 that we've defined from what you've told us  
what is important from the Federal  
8 proposals.

The Federal Subsistence Board  
9 also helps to identify issues. The two  
major themes that come up before the Board  
10 has been the reconsideration for the rural  
determination for the Kenai Peninsula.  
11 That's been something that's very much  
guided, project selection and  
12 recommendation, and finally just Copper  
River chinook and sockeye salmon issues  
13 which we spent the last day and a half  
dealing with.

14 What I'm going to do is get into  
a very brief report of the progress of the  
15 programs in the Cook Inlet/Gulf of Alaska  
region; and, again, that region is -- it's  
16 actually very similar to the region that you  
cover, includes just what it says, Cook  
17 Inlet, Prince William Sound, and the Copper  
River.

18 In the last two years, we've  
implemented a total of 11 projects. These  
19 11 projects are a mixture of two basic types  
that we recognize. One is called "Stock  
20 Status and Trends," and those tend to be  
projects that assess fish stocks, projects  
21 like weirs, like tagging projects, like  
survey projects, basically anything that's  
22 looking primarily at fish abundance, fish  
composition, those kinds of things.

23 Then there's another category of  
project that we call Harvest Monitoring or  
24 TEK, Traditional Ecological Knowledge.  
Harvest Monitoring of fishery systems and  
25 projects that deal with the collection and  
understanding of traditional and ecological



1 knowledge.

2 The other thing I'd like to real  
3 briefly point out is that these projects are  
4 in the public eye. In your packet I've got  
5 a -- a page that looks like this, but two of  
6 these projects actually made it into the  
7 papers in various communities. One of the  
8 projects that was funded was a project  
9 dealing with hooligan in Turnagain and it  
10 was in the Anchorage Daily News in the past  
11 year. Then there's a very large project  
12 that's administered by the Native Village of  
13 Eyak dealing with king salmon and they have  
14 a newspaper that covered a lot of that. So,  
15 as I say, several of these projects are  
16 definitely in the public eye and coming out  
17 in the public media.

18 The next thing I'm going to speak  
19 to in that packet is this table. It's the  
20 same table that appears in this book, and  
21 all this is just a listing of the projects,  
22 the amount of money that's associated with  
23 them that have been funded already. And if  
24 you look at that table, which is called  
25 Table 1, just going from left to right,  
there's a column there that says FIS number.  
That's just simply our accounting system so  
we can keep track of these projects and have  
a unique number. Then we have the data  
type, SST, which is Stock Status and Trends,  
or TED, Traditional Ecological Knowledge,  
that categorizes each of the projects, the  
name of the project, the primary  
investigators of that project, and then the  
money associated with that project, and you  
can see on the money end which is over on  
the far right, a lot of projects go on for  
three years. And, again, these are projects  
that were initiated either in the year 2000  
or just this last year in 2001.

Now, when you look at the spreads  
of those projects, most of them are grouped  
under the top heading, which is called  
Copper River salmon, and most of the  
projects and most of the money have gone  
towards issues dealing with Copper River  
salmon which is not a big surprise. And  
there's both stock status projects and  
harvest monitoring TEK projects.

If you move down the table, there

1 are two projects that are associated with  
2 Copper River steelhead, a single project  
3 that's associated with Prince William Sound  
4 salmon and then we had funded two projects  
5 in Cook Inlet. So what I'm going to do next  
6 now is just very briefly touch on each one  
7 of these projects and give you a report of  
8 progress on those projects.

9 I'm just going to take it from  
10 the top and go right down the table.

11 Dealing with Copper River salmon,  
12 we funded a small project to actually put a  
13 weir in Tanana Creek, which a tributary to  
14 the Copper River which is the stream that is  
15 immediately or right at the Batzulnetas  
16 Subsistence Fishery. That project in the  
17 first year was not successful, the weir blew  
18 out. However, this past year the  
19 investigators came up with a new weir  
20 design. They installed it in the creek,  
21 successfully held it. In fact, I went to  
22 that project, and I would suggest that weir  
23 would hold in just about any conceivable  
24 water for that Creek. They successfully ran  
25 the project this last year and they will run  
it again in 2002 which will be the final  
year of funding commitment for that project.

The other thing I'm going to  
touch on with each one of these projects is  
at least give you our initial assessment as  
to whether there should be a future for some  
of these projects. In other words, should  
you consider and should we consider trying  
to fund them beyond three years. This one  
that I think ought to be considered for  
funding on into the future, it's estimating  
a small salmon stock for which there is a  
lot of concern that directly feeds a very  
important subsistence fishery and getting a  
longer time of information than three years  
might be a rational approach on it for the  
future.

The next project -- another  
project that was started in the first year,  
in 2000, the Miles Lake sonar improvement,  
that's one of the projects that's actually  
happening as we speak. We provided money to  
improve the substrate for the sonar at Miles  
Lake which is the major salmon assessment  
project for Copper River salmon. There was

1 actually a budget shortfall for that  
project. When they actually put it out to  
2 bid with the contractors -- what they're  
doing is they're pouring concrete to put the  
3 sonar substrate on, the bids came in higher  
than what was expected. However, I am happy  
4 to report, Fish & Game actually covered the  
budget shortfall out of some other funds;  
5 and as I say, that work is actually ongoing  
as we speak.

6 The next project is Project 20.  
Now this is a project that was funded just  
7 this last year. It's one of the ones we  
talked about in February, Copper River  
8 chinook salmon abundance project. It's a  
very large project. And what it's doing is  
9 looking at the feasibility of using  
fishwheels to capture chinook or king salmon  
10 for tagging and trying to estimate the total  
abundance of king salmon in the Copper  
11 River. This project is actually being  
conducted by the Native Village of Eyak, and  
12 this is one where we had a tremendous amount  
of success this past year. It's trying to  
13 do it in a very different way. They've put  
fishwheels down in the Lower Copper River,  
14 down at Baird Canyon. They've built some  
incredibly large number. Then they put a  
15 weir down there. They caught about 900 king  
salmon, which is a significant number of  
16 king that came up the Copper River. That  
Project is very much on track from what was  
17 originally envisioned, and it's going to be  
expanded this year to include an upriver  
18 capture site.

19 There are some issues with that  
process, we're in the process of dealing  
with that I think, those are very  
20 achievable.

21 MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, can I  
ask a question? There is a project for  
22 monitoring chinook escapement. How far up  
are you talking about escape? I would say  
23 I'm about half -- close to halfway up the  
river, Copper River escapement from where?  
24

25 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, sir. It's  
actually escapement into the Copper River,  
past the commercial fishery is what it would

1 do, and it's marking fish in Baird Canyon,  
2 which is several miles above Miles Lake  
3 sonar, but it's well below any spawning  
4 locations and it's also well below any  
5 upriver fishing. So, it will be estimating  
6 total abundance of king salmon in the Copper  
7 River past the commercial fishery.

8  
9 MR. LOHSE: Could you tell  
10 everybody what kind of tags they were  
11 putting in the salmon there?

12 MR. MCBRIDE: They did some  
13 tagging this year. Their primary purpose  
14 was to try to make sure they captured enough  
15 fish. The tags they're putting in are  
16 spaghetti tags, long pieces of plastic.  
17 They have numbers written on them and then  
18 the identification is who is doing it.

19 MR. LOHSE: Did they use any  
20 radio transponder ones?

21 MR. MCBRIDE: No, they didn't  
22 this year. In fact, when we get to the 2002  
23 recommendations of projects for  
24 consideration for new work, I'll just go  
25 ahead to the project we're recommending, a  
radio tagging project that we'll add on to  
this project. It will supplement that  
effort.

MR. LOHSE: One last question.  
Do you know if any of the tags were  
recovered?

MR. EVANSON: None of the actual  
tags were recovered. They marked a number  
of fish with thin clips and punches that  
were recovered at the -- my name is Matt  
Evanson. I'm with the Department --

A SPEAKER: Come to the table.

MR. EVANSON: Mr. Chairman, Matt  
Evanson, Department of Fish & Game, and  
we were operating a chinook salmon

1 assessment this year in addition to the one  
2 that the Native Village of Eyak was running  
3 this year. We were sampling the Glennallen  
4 Subdistrict and Chitina Subdistrict  
5 fisheries. I don't believe I have the exact  
6 number of how many they marked. I think it  
7 was 3 or 400 marks that they gave a thin  
8 click or punch to. Of those we recovered  
9 about four from the Glennallen Subdistrict  
10 Fishery, and three or four from the Chitina  
11 Subdistrict Fishery.

12  
13 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

14  
15 MR. LINK: My name is Michael  
16 Link. I'm with LGL in the Native Village of  
17 Eyak. I wanted to clarify, we didn't put  
18 actual tags. We were putting small hole  
19 punches in the gill of the fish. I think we  
20 did 2 or 300 fish, just in case for the  
21 record it wasn't like there was 400 marked  
22 or tagged fish and none were subsequently  
23 captured.

24  
25 MR. LOHSE: Thank you. Sorry to  
26 have misinterpreted you.

27  
28 MR. MCBRIDE: I'm sorry to have  
29 misunderstood the question. Ultimately they  
30 will be putting tags on the fish. The  
31 primary point this year -- the primary  
32 question is is it feasible to capture fish  
33 in the river. The point of this is build  
34 the fishwheels, get them down there, and see  
35 if they can actually capture fish.

36  
37 MR. ELVSASS: I have a question.

38  
39 MR. LOHSE: Yes. Fred?

40  
41 MR. ELVSASS: On the funding, are  
42 we talking in hundreds or thousands here?

43  
44 MR. MCBRIDE: I'm sorry, those  
45 are in thousands. So if you look at that  
46 table, the very first number on there,  
47 abundance of type of salmon; 50, it's  
48 \$50,000. Put three zeros after every one of

1 those numbers, 55 means 55,000. 44 means  
2 44,000. Actually add two zeros.

3 MR. ELVSASS: Fishwheel, \$300.  
4 That's kind of more than just the wheel.  
5 That's the program as a whole, then --

6 MR. MCBRIDE: (Nods head.)

7 MR. LOHSE: Roy?

8 MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I have a  
9 question, because you mentioned tag, what  
10 the regulation says about that. Is it a  
11 requirement that you turn them in? I don't  
12 know who could answer that. I'm just  
13 wondering if some people are throwing them  
14 away or what's going on.

15 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Roy,  
16 no, there is no requirement. There is no  
17 legal requirement for anybody to turn a tag  
18 in. Ultimately, the way the project will be  
19 run is there will be people tagging the fish  
20 and then actively recovering the fish either  
21 through their own sampling, either through  
22 their own fishing efforts or by actively  
23 sampling fisheries, perhaps such as yours,  
24 further upriver. But there will be people  
25 actively looking, not only for tagged fish,  
but then the total number of fish -- they  
have to examine, you know, both tagged and  
untagged fish to make the estimate work.  
They'll be actively looking for them. It  
won't just be a voluntary effort to turn  
tags in. There is no legal requirement to  
turn tags in.

26 MR. KNAUER: Bill Knauer, Fish &  
27 Wildlife Subsistence Management. There is a  
28 legal requirement for -- with any tagged  
29 animal or fish that if there is a tag, there  
30 is a legal requirement to turn the tag in.  
31 The fish doesn't have to be. So, that --  
32 that is in the subsistence regulations.  
33 It's also in the State of Alaska regulations  
34 that there's a requirement to turn in tags.  
35 Thank you.

1           MR. LOHSE: So the requirement is  
2           there. The usual reward is just offered as  
3           an incentive then?

4           MR. KNAUER: There's normally no  
5           reward other than knowing that you have  
6           contributed to sound wildlife and fisheries  
7           management.

8           MR. LOHSE: Do you mean there's  
9           no hats or no certificates or no dollar  
10          bills, T-shirts or anything?

11          MR. ELVSASS: You know, the hat  
12          program on a tag return worked real well for  
13          a dollar. Most people would rather wear  
14          them on their hat. If you look at the crab  
15          tagging programs in the past years, you  
16          know, we would get tags by the hundreds on  
17          certain days, and we'd turn some in and let  
18          them know we got a lot of them, but most of  
19          the crew liked to keep the tags, so we'd  
20          just flip coins for the tags and never turn  
21          them in. But the hat program did get tags.

22          MR. LOHSE: Okay. Sorry.

23          MR. MCBRIDE: Fred, based on the  
24          information that Bill Knauer gave us, I'm  
25          not sure I would admit to that fire drill.

(Laughter.)

1           MR. MCBRIDE: Moving on to the  
2           last stock project that I want to briefly  
3           mention, Project 21, king season abundance  
4           estimate for the Lower Copper River. Again,  
5           this is a large project that's being done by  
6           the Native Village of Eyak and their  
7           contractor, LGL. And what this project is  
8           attempting to do is to develop what amounts  
9           to an in-test fishery low down in the Copper  
10          River. This would be actually below the  
11          Miles Lake sonar. It's right in the  
12          vicinity of where the highway crosses Copper  
13          River, and what they'll be doing there is  
14          using a combination or trying to use a  
15          combination of sonar and gil netting to

1 index the abundance of salmon, primarily  
2 sockeye salmon well before they get to Miles  
3 Lake which is about roughly four to seven  
4 days' travel distance for those salmon.  
5 And, again, that project was implemented for  
6 the first time this year. They did meet all  
7 the project objectives. I think it's real  
8 important that project that you -- that we  
9 certainly view that as a feasibility effort.  
10 The challenges of working in that part of  
11 the world -- in that part of the river are  
12 formidable, and it's very much a feasibility  
13 effort to see whether it will work or not.  
14 As I say, it is ongoing. They did meet all  
15 the objectives for the summer, and we'll  
16 proceed as planned for 2002.

17 There are two projects, two  
18 harvest monitoring and TEK projects that  
19 deal with Copper River salmon. The first  
20 one is a -- is Project 40. This was  
21 implemented in the first year in 2000. It's  
22 Copper River Subsistence Salmon Fishery  
23 Evaluation, and that project is actually  
24 nearly complete. The data collection is  
25 nearly complete. In fact, next on your  
agenda, the principal investigator, Bill  
Someone is going to be giving you a much  
more detailed investigation of that project.  
I won't go into that. They'll be giving a  
much more detailed story on that.

The final project, 217, workshop  
to build capacity among Copper River Groups.  
That is a project run by CRNA, and this is  
one project that was not -- it was supposed  
to be started, implemented this year.  
However, it won't be implemented until next  
year. That really isn't their fault, it's  
much more our fault. If you'll remember, we  
met on this last year, February, then the  
Federal Board is actually the  
decision-making body that makes the final  
funding calls. That meeting didn't happen  
until the end of February, and then after  
that, we had a few funding agreements to  
actually make the money available to all  
these groups and that project was real  
critical, the timing of it was real  
critical. They were supposed to start in  
March, and there wasn't enough time to get  
the funding and guidelines and get the



1 funding in March. What we're going to do is  
2 simply do the Project starting this coming  
year instead of last year.

That's all the Copper River  
3 salmon projects. What I'm going to move to  
now is the Copper River steelhead projects.  
4 There are two projects there that I want to  
briefly touch on. The first one is Project  
5 188, Stock Status for Copper River  
Steelhead. That's a project being done by  
6 Fish & Game. What that project is  
attempting to do and successfully doing is  
7 estimating spawner abundance of the two  
known steelhead spawning stocks in the  
8 middle fork -- the middle fork started in  
the spring, the Hanagita started in August,  
9 maybe if it's not completed, it's very  
nearly completed. So that project will be  
10 going on as planned.

The second project, Project 35,  
11 harvest monitoring of Copper River  
steelhead. That's a Project that is being  
12 done by CRNA and what that project is  
attempting to do is to do monitoring of the  
13 fishwheel harvest in the new early part of  
the season, that last two weeks of May  
14 season. And, again, that project was  
successfully implemented this past year. In  
15 fact, what -- the project's been altered  
somewhat. They're actually going to beef up  
16 the number of fishwheels that get monitored.  
They're going to go from two to four.  
17 Again, that project is going to successfully  
go forward as planned.

Both these projects will be  
18 completed in 2003, and unless there's  
19 something really surprising about that  
information, this is some of the work that  
20 we should probably consider as completed  
when the projects are done. In other words,  
21 you know, there may not -- we may want to  
look at different work as opposed to  
22 continuing the work on Copper steelhead.

Now I'm going to move on to  
23 Prince William Sound salmon. There's only a  
single Project funded here. Again, that's  
24 very consistent with the systems information  
needs that you and the Board defined. Here  
25 we're extending a project to extend the Dot  
Lake weir. The suggestion is to extend it

1 beyond the sockeye weir in coho. The weir  
2 was put in last year. It failed. They ran  
3 into very significant flooding events. The  
4 weir has blown out. Even though they  
5 counted some cohos, the likelihood is a lot  
6 of fish moved up during the flooding. For  
7 this project to complete its last year,  
8 we're going to work with them to see if  
9 something can't be done either to the weir  
10 designs so they can withstand the likely  
11 flood events or perhaps move into some type  
12 of tagging estimate where we can have a  
13 backup program for when the weir floods out.  
14 Again, this is one I think once it's  
15 completed in 2002, we probably ought to  
16 consider this one complete.

17 Then the final area I'm going to  
18 talk about are the two projects in Cook  
19 Inlet. There were projects that happened  
20 here. The first one, Project 38, Copper  
21 Creek weir, a small project to put a weir in  
22 Copper Creek which is very close to Cooper  
23 Landing to look at Dolly Varden. That weir  
24 was successfully installed. We're talking  
25 about a very small population of Dolly  
26 Varden, but given what's happened to that  
27 creek, the dam that's been put in years ago,  
28 that's not surprising, but that project will  
29 be completed in 2002 and again should  
30 probably be considered complete once it's  
31 done.

32 And then the final one, in fact I  
33 talked about it initially was the Eulachon  
34 study. That was the one that's in the Daily  
35 News. That's the project being done by the  
36 Forest Service looking at hooligan or  
37 Eulachon in Turnagain Arm just south of  
38 Anchorage, primarily in the 20-Mile, and  
39 that project has actually undergone a lot of  
40 alteration. I think they've made a  
41 tremendous amount of progress. Where we're  
42 at on that project is to make that progress.  
43 They had to use up their funds for the third  
44 year, which we approved doing. I think it  
45 was a rational thing to do. But at this  
46 point, the likelihood of that program  
47 continuing is -- it's probably going to be  
48 wrapped up completely with the work that  
49 they've done, they completed this year.

1           MR. LOHSE: Now, when you say  
2     that it's successful, basically, it has an  
3     estimate of hooligan subsistence use for one  
4     year, right?

5           MR. MCBRIDE: Actually, what they  
6     concentrated on was trying to assess the  
7     hooligan resource itself. They were going  
8     to follow up with the actual harvest  
9     assessment, but that work at least right now  
10    is probably not going to happen just because  
11    the funds are already utilized, but I think  
12    they made some progress in terms of setting  
13    up a program that if we or somebody else  
14    wanted to continue to try to index hooligan  
15    abundance, you could do it.

16          MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I was looking  
17    at both of these projects right here, and  
18    just, you know, both of those fish I know a  
19    little bit about, not a real lot, but I do  
20    know that dollies -- the fact there's no  
21    dollies spawning in the creek one year or  
22    even two years doesn't mean you don't have  
23    dollies spawning in the creek. They go from  
24    one creek to another creek. They do a lot  
25    of jumping around. And the hooligan vary  
26    quite widely, so a one-year estimate on  
27    population of hooligan doesn't mean  
28    anything. I mean, it just shows that year  
29    that's what the population was or that year  
30    that's what the population wasn't.

31          So, I mean, if they're going to  
32    come out with any information from one of  
33    these kind of projects, it has to be done  
34    over a long enough time period that you can  
35    take some of the variations out of it.

36          So, I guess what I'm saying is if  
37    our object is to get valid information,  
38    somewhere or another we have to decide that  
39    if a project proves successful we've got to  
40    do it long enough to get valid information  
41    or we shouldn't have even started with it.

42          You know, so I don't know how  
43    to -- I don't know how to go from that  
44    standpoint, but I guess I don't have -- I  
45    don't have a lot of use for short-term  
46    fisheries projects because short-term  
47    fisheries projects don't prove anything.

1           MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman,  
2     you're raising some very valid points and I  
3     think it's really going to be a major topic  
4     of discussion, not only with the staff, but  
5     with the Council and the Board because  
6     you're exactly right. A lot of this  
7     information is best -- has the highest value  
8     as a long-term series of information, but  
9     the question is going to be how much can we  
10    afford, and for Cook Inlet, at least what I  
11    think -- what we're -- we're kind of jumping  
12    ahead here, some discussions in the next  
13    presentation, but as -- along the lines of  
14    what Tom Boyd talked with you about right at  
15    the very beginning of the meeting yesterday,  
16    I think the priority for information for  
17    Cook Inlet is going to be actually harvest  
18    monitoring, documenting subsistence needs  
19    and use. That's what we spoke to yesterday,  
20    and definitely add a little bit more  
21    discussion about that here today. So, what  
22    we're recommending is that some of the  
23    assessment work, the actual fish stock  
24    assessment work try to.

13           MR. OLINDE: Bring it to some  
14    logical conclusion, Cooper Creek, we'll have  
15    a couple of years of information, Cooper  
16    Creek. It doesn't surprise me it's a very  
17    small population of Dolly Varden. I don't  
18    think if we continue that project we'll find  
19    something dramatically different. I think  
20    any future fish stock in Cook Inlet, it will  
21    be highly dependent on the intensity of the  
22    subsistence fisheries. The subsistence  
23    fisheries are still under discussion. As to  
24    what they look like, that's why Tom  
25    recommended getting harvest use information.  
26    What we're recommending is a stepwise  
27    approach. Let's figure out the harvest use,  
28    figure out the fisheries, then figure out  
29    where we can address the efforts of doing  
30    the stock assessment.

31           Okay. Just to wrap up, at least  
32    what I was prepared to talk about for the  
33    fishery resource monitoring program in this  
34    region, most of the 11 projects were  
35    successfully implemented. We feel real  
36    strongly that significant progress was made  
37    in building capacity of rural organizations.

1 I think the two we can point to out of the  
2 existing program are Native Village of Eyak  
and the Copper River Native Association.

Most of these projects have  
3 funding commitments in this coming year in  
2002 and will continue as planned. There  
4 are a few projects there and some questions  
of study design and we will resolve these  
5 with the contractors prior to proceeding in  
2002. And as I talked about as I went  
6 through them, I think several of these  
projects should be considered for  
7 continuation beyond their current funding  
commitments. As we come up on each  
8 individual year, we'll be going through that  
with you and discussing the pros and cons.

9 That concludes this part of the  
presentation and if there's any other  
10 questions or comments, now would probably be  
the best time before we move on to the next  
11 subject.

12 Fred?

MR. ELVSASS: I think just a  
13 question on the weir at Tanada Creek. After  
the funding expires and so forth, if it's  
14 not refunded, what do you do with the weir?  
Do you take it out?

15 MR. MCBRIDE: In that particular  
16 case, I think the answer is, yes. I mean,  
the materials would be taken off the site  
17 and probably used as a weir somewhere else.  
But, I doubt that -- I'm sure it would not  
18 be left there. That's a fairly accessible  
site. Getting them out is certainly  
19 logistically feasible.

20 MR. ELVSASS: I'm thinking if  
this program doesn't continue there may be  
21 some other program that could. You know, it  
would be a shame to tear the weir down after  
22 all the trouble of getting it there.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. LOHSE: Roy?

25 MR. EWAN: I think you touched on  
some of these projects that are more or less  
ongoing and seems to me like the salmon is

1 going to be ongoing for a long time, and I  
don't know about the others. That's why I  
2 want to ask the question about the  
steelhead. I know we don't know much about  
3 the steelhead. Is there a lot of  
subsistence people getting steelheads? To  
4 your knowledge to have an ongoing, you know,  
monitoring program?

5 MR. MCBRIDE: The subsistence  
6 steelhead harvest is very low by any  
measure. They're certainly caught; they're  
7 certainly utilized; and I think given the  
relatively small level of use to look at  
8 that steelhead project as an ongoing year  
after-year-type effort, that probably is not  
9 what we would recommend into the future.  
That's why I made the comment that unless  
10 there's something very, very surprising in  
that information that would indicate a much  
11 higher level of exploitation than we think  
exists, my guess is that project will  
12 successfully be brought to conclusion, even  
though it's not a long-term series of  
13 information, I think it will provide a valid  
snapshot of what's going on that could be  
14 then checked, you know, later without having  
to do it annually.

15 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions?  
16 How about if we take about a  
ten-minute break right now, so we can have  
17 voice rest?

18 (Break.)

19 MR. LOHSE: We'll call this  
20 meeting of the Southcentral Regional  
Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back  
21 in session. We've been talking about  
resource monitoring projects, and future  
22 resource monitoring projects are coming up  
at this time. I'd like to, while we're  
23 waiting for Bill Simeone to finish his  
things up, I'd like to invite two people to  
24 come up, and one of them to tell us about a  
project that they'd like to present to us,  
25 and one of them to tell us about a project  
that she's working on.

1           Would you come up and tell us  
2   about the project that you'd like to bring  
3   before the Council? We'll have information  
4   on this on a later date.

5           MS. BROWN-SCHWALENBERG: My name  
6   is Patty Brown-Schwalenberg. I'm the  
7   executive director of the Chugach Regional  
8   Resources Commission. I'm a nonNative  
9   person. I work on the Chugach region for  
10   the Chugach environmental region. Thank you  
11   for allowing me -- to squeeze me in as I  
12   have to leave in a few minutes for another  
13   meeting. I wanted to comment on some of the  
14   projects that are -- some are not being  
15   recommended for funding and some are --  
16   we're looking for funding in the future.

17           The first one is the one that I  
18   wrote in a letter to Chairman Lohse from the  
19   Chief of Tatitlek, regarding Project 01-158,  
20   the stock assessment in Shrode Lake in  
21   Prince William Sound. We were here in  
22   February and testified regarding this  
23   project and we had concerns that there was  
24   no capacity building in that project, so the  
25   Council or the Council at that time  
26   recommended that we go back and work with  
27   Fish & Game to try and beef that up a bit,  
28   and so we did. We had some extensive  
29   meetings with Forest Service and Alaska  
30   Department of Fish & Game and I think the  
31   project is a very good example of  
32   capacity-building, not only local hire in  
33   there, there's a training component.  
34   There's funding going directly to the Native  
35   organization. Unfortunately, under that  
36   category where the project is there's not  
37   enough money to fund that, according to the  
38   technical review committee. They're not  
39   recommending that one be funded because of  
40   the issues on the Copper River.

41           Now refresh your memory. This  
42   was the project that the communities of  
43   Chenega and Tatitlek brought forward last  
44   year because of the road opening to White  
45   River, the increased amount of fishing in  
46   those two areas which are prime subsistence  
47   areas for those two communities, so they're  
48   concerned about the amount of fish available  
49   for those communities. And the recreational

1 fisheries as well.

2 So, it's a very important project  
3 for Prince William Sound and it would -- we  
4 would be grateful if the Council would  
5 reconsider that project. I understand  
6 there's a lot of funding limitations, but  
7 there isn't a lot of money going into Prince  
8 William Sound versus the Copper projects.  
9 And this one is as important to the people  
10 in that area as the Copper River projects  
11 are to the people in the Copper River area.

12 The other project that I wanted  
13 to comment on was the Chugach region  
14 resource data layer as a template for TEK  
15 project which is 02-028. The Technical  
16 Review Committee recommended that for  
17 funding, and that's one that we are going to  
18 be working with in -- with Chugach Regional  
19 Resources Commission, and we are already  
20 putting in a GIS database and mapping out  
21 subsistence areas and harvest -- harvest  
22 areas and subsistence resource areas, and  
23 this project is -- will complement work  
24 that's already being done, so we -- we're  
25 pleased to see that the Technical Review  
Committee is recommending that be funded.

1 And then, finally, just a comment  
2 on the Chugach Region Subsistence Harvest  
3 Monitoring Program, which was not  
4 recommended for funding. If you remember in  
5 February we talked about this project, and  
6 the Council asked that we do a harvest  
7 monitoring assessment in the whole Chugach  
8 region including Port Graham, Nanwalek, and  
9 Seldovia which we had agreed, and through  
10 the summer and working with the Federal  
11 Office of Subsistence Management, it ended  
12 up not being funded, but I just -- just a  
13 word about that is we did a subsistence  
14 harvest monitoring program in cooperation  
15 with Fish & Game a couple of years ago, and  
16 there was a major training component where  
17 the people that were actually doing the  
18 interviews were training how to do  
19 interviews. They actually assisted with  
20 setting up the interview document, and came  
21 back into Anchorage and learned how to  
22 assess the information once it was gathered,  
23 and were able to look at the database that  
24 Fish & Game uses to -- where that data is



1 entered, so there was a great understanding  
2 of how that was going to be working, so we  
3 were taking that knowledge and putting it  
4 into a project for the Federal Subsistence  
5 Board to consider. The comment from the  
6 technical review committee was that there's  
7 not enough technical -- technical assistance  
8 or oversight, and we really feel that the --  
9 if the Tribes are going to learn how to do  
10 this, they need to start being able to do  
11 some of this with some oversight, not major  
12 oversight. If they've already proved that  
13 they can do it, then we do have biological  
14 assistance on the Tribal side, that we  
15 should be able to do these kinds of things  
16 with a lesser role from either Fish & Game  
17 or UAA or whatever agency that we choose to  
18 work with.

19 So, that's all I have. So if  
20 there's any questions, I'd be happy to  
21 answer them.

22  
23 MR. LOHSE: Does anybody have any  
24 questions?

25 Thank you.

26 At this time I'd like to have  
27 Bruce Cain come up if he can and put the  
28 papers on our desks, and one of the projects  
29 that was talked about by the last presenter,  
30 we talked about monitoring on the Copper  
31 River -- Lower Copper River, the fishwheel  
32 and the sonar. And I thought that possibly  
33 Bill could -- Bruce could give us some  
34 information, Bruce and Mike could give us  
35 some information on those projects.

36  
37 MR. CAIN: Thank you, Ralph. I'm  
38 Bruce Cain. I'm the director for the Native  
39 Village of Eyak. I'd like to introduce our  
40 Council president. He's in the back of the  
41 room, Robert Henrich. I have Robert, and  
42 Tim Joyce from the Forest Service is also  
43 here for questions; and I just wanted to  
44 give a brief report on our projects this  
45 summer. We had two pretty good size  
46 projects that the Subsistence Board -- the  
47 Federal Subsistence Board funded, and during  
48 the break I put out two written reports and  
49 these are also in the back if anybody wants

1 to also get some off the back, and then  
there's 25 of our June newsletters if you  
2 want to get those and have information on  
our projects.

3 And I think I'll just turn it  
over to Michael, who was our lead biologist  
4 on this project, and he's with LBL Limited.  
They're an environmental and natural  
5 resource consulting firm, and he was -- did  
a lot of the work on the project, and a lot  
6 of the design.

And then after a brief review, if  
7 anybody has a question, we'll be happy to  
answer them.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: Mike?

10 MR. LINK: Michael Link, L-i-n-k.  
I think Doug McBride did a good job of  
11 summarizing the project. Just a few points  
that I wanted to make that came up and there  
12 may be a little bit of confusion about the  
tag recovery and stuff. What we were hoping  
13 to do with that project is catch and tag one  
or 2,000 fish down near Bear Canyon, near  
14 Miles Lake, chinook salmon, king salmon, and  
then have a site that we'll operate as a  
15 part of the project, somewhere up the river,  
maybe 15 or 20 miles upriver and we will  
16 resample the run there and we'll be looking  
for a portion of the fish that have tags on.

17 And so the project will provide  
us with an estimate of the chinook  
18 escapement and the chinook run where we put  
the tags on. It will be at Miles Lake  
19 basically, just clarifying an earlier  
question.

20 And on the tag recovery, we will  
get some information from people turning  
21 tags in, but the actual population what you  
derive from looking at fish that are tagged  
22 and fish that are not tagged, and so we  
don't really have a lot -- until I heard  
23 that there may be a legal requirement for  
people to turn in tags, we didn't really  
24 have any plans to solicit or pursue the  
tags, they may not even have an address  
25 printed on them. They may just be numbered.  
They need to be numbered. If we do have an

1 address, we want to send out information to  
2 people on when and where the fish was  
3 tagged. The project isn't going to rely on  
4 anyone returning tags. We may be in the  
5 fishwheel fishery hoping to look at that  
6 same information, how many have tags, how  
7 many have no tags in the sample. Voluntary  
8 recovery won't provide us with a population  
9 estimate. I think that's really important.  
10 Those are two clarifying points. The  
11 project did go very well. Budget was  
12 mentioned there. I think there was two  
13 items mentioned in the budget, may be  
14 reversed, 2001 or 2002, and I just wanted to  
15 say on that note, the Native Village of Eyak  
16 and our organization went above and beyond  
17 the budget to make this one work. We all  
18 contributed a lot of -- a lot of additional  
19 time and resources, so in year one and  
20 probably in year two because we're going to  
21 expand the fishing effort upstream. Our  
22 budget doesn't even really reflect what it  
23 costs. It was an enormous effort. There  
24 was a dozen or 15 people involved, supply  
25 flights and even helicopters at some point.  
When we got into the lower river at the end  
of May, there was still eight feet of snow  
on the ground. Miles Lake was still frozen  
solid. It was -- getting that kind of  
equipment mobilized and down the river on  
20-year low waters was a real challenge and  
the Native Village of Eyak put a lot into it  
beyond what we're getting from OSM. If  
there's any technical questions, I'll be  
happy to respond.

19 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
20 Mike?

21 I don't know so much it's a  
22 question as a comment. You know, I know an  
23 estimate of population estimate is the basic  
24 goal of the project, but the one thing that  
25 I can see that can come from making an  
effort to recover tags is there's other  
information that can be gathered on the  
project. As a side shoot we could gather --  
we can gather information as to where these  
fish are utilized, taken, or whatever you  
want to call it. We can also gather  
information as to where they go. I mean,

1 the fish that are tagged with number, take a  
2 number off the top of my head, 1400 shows up  
3 in Key Bay, went through the fishery on June  
4 12th, versus the fish that showed up  
5 somewhere else that went through the fishery  
6 on the 1st of May or something like that.  
7 Those are the kinds of things that I would  
8 hate to see -- I would hate to see you not  
9 follow up on the tags because to me there's  
10 just a wealth of other information that can  
11 be gathered as to where the fish go, what  
12 time they pass through different places.  
13 Some of it more valid than others, but --  
14 you know --

15  
16 MR. LINK: The tags we purchased  
17 is part of the progress. We help to get  
18 people to mail them in. We may buy a bunch  
19 of hats to get people to participate. Don't  
20 get me wrong. I didn't want to confuse the  
21 issue that the project was relying on that.  
22 One -- the telemetry will give us a lot as  
23 well. It tells us where the people caught  
24 them, not necessarily where they went. You  
25 do get something out of them. We don't want  
to ignore them. I don't want somebody to  
ask me, they didn't ask for the tag. They  
can't come up with a valid population  
estimate.

16 MR. LOHSE: I think we see the  
17 population estimate is not based on tags.  
18 You're doing the same projects that Fish &  
19 Wildlife did in 1968 at Moose Canyon.

18  
19 MR. LINK: They were catching  
20 king salmon. Ken Overson gave us a lot of  
21 help in designing ours, Correct? He had a  
22 little bit of trouble.

21 MR. LOHSE: Basically, the same  
22 ratio type of project.

22 Okay. Any other questions for  
23 Mike?

23 Any questions for Bruce?

24 I understand that you ended up  
25 getting a lot of donations in time and labor  
and assistance in boats and planes and  
helicopters and everything else that took  
you beyond the scope of the budget. Do you

1 expect to be able to get that kind of help  
2 in the future?

3 MR. CAIN: We're working on it  
4 all the time. So, we do have some  
5 additional funding from some other sources  
6 that's been very helpful, plus our Council  
7 has been really involved, and even using --  
8 donating their own personal equipment and  
9 going out and working. So that helps a lot  
10 in making it go.

11 There was just a couple other  
12 announcements I wanted to just mention.  
13 This year we're going to be designing an  
14 upriver recovery program and, you know, if  
15 anybody that's fishing upriver or has  
16 fishwheels or has some ideas that might help  
17 us, let us know. What we need to do is we  
18 need to look at all the kind that we catch.  
19 We need to see how many are tagged and how  
20 many aren't. Basically, that's the  
21 objective.

22 And then the other thing is,  
23 November 29th and 30th, we're having our  
24 fall workshop on this project in Cordova,  
25 and everyone who is interested is invited  
26 and please let us know, and as long as I'm  
27 announcing events, November 9th, 10th, 11th  
28 is our sobriety celebration in Cordova too.  
29 Those are some of the things that are  
30 happening.

31 MR. LOHSE: What were the dates?

32 MR. CAIN: 29th and 30th of  
33 November is our fall workshop. We'll be  
34 going over the results of -- pretty formal  
35 results of our -- both projects, should be  
36 all wrapped up in a reportable format. A  
37 lot of the sonar technicians and scientists  
38 will be there.

39 And then the 9th, 10th, and 11th  
40 is our sobriety date celebration.

41 Thank you.  
42 Anybody else have any questions?  
43 Roy?

44 MR. EWAN: I have a question  
45 about the fishwheel -- were there two of

1     them?

2             MR. CAIN: Yes, two.

3             MR. EWAN: What would you do with  
4     the fish?

5             MR. LINK: Actually, if you got  
6     this --

7             MR. EWAN: I didn't read it.

8             MR. LINK: Front page of Eyak  
9     Echo, you can see the bottom left corner  
10    it's got the two wheels partially assembled.  
11    They have huge live capture, the fish were  
12    deposited in the river water where they swim  
13    around, we tagged some and then let the rest  
14    go.

15            We caught, I think it was 900 --  
16    just under 900 king salmon and 25,000  
17    sockeye. And those were all put back in the  
18    river alive. We visited the wheel five  
19    times a day.

20            MR. LOHSE: I think that's an  
21    understanding that needs to be reached is  
22    that you're not taking any fish out of these  
23    fishwheels?

24            MR. LINK: Correct. It's all  
25    live capture, correct.

26            MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
27    Thank you. With that, what we'd  
28    like to do today is we'd like -- Bill  
29    Simeone has got a report. He's not  
30    available to be here tomorrow. We'd like to  
31    have him give his report right now, and then  
32    when we finish that, we'll go back on this  
33    and I think we're going to have to do our  
34    decisions on it tomorrow, probably. It must  
35    be close to 4:00.

36            MR. ELVSASS: 3:30.

37            MR. SIMEONE: As usually,  
38    technology -- I also gave you a handout so  
39    you can follow along.

1           Let's see here.  
2           Anyway, I'll do it sort of  
3           without it.

4           Excuse me. All right. My name  
5           is Bill Simeone. I work for the Alaska  
6           Department of Fish & Game, Division of  
7           Subsistence. In 2000, the Division of  
8           Subsistence received funding from the Office  
9           of Subsistence Management to update the  
10          division's research on the Copper River  
11          Subsistence Fishery. The project had two  
12          purposes: Basically the first one was to  
13          update the patterns and trends in the  
14          subsistence fishery of the Copper River, and  
15          the second purpose was the computation of  
16          people's knowledge of salmon. To update  
17          information on the subsistence fishery, the  
18          division conducted a survey of subsistence  
19          fishers in both the Glennallen and the  
20          Chitina Subdistricts to help document Ahtna  
21          traditional knowledge and the division hired  
22          a linguist, Dr. James Carey, who is a  
23          student of the Ahtna language. For both  
24          components we worked in collaboration with  
25          the Copper Native Association, the Chitina  
26          Tribal Council, Chichna Tribal Council.  
27          This presentation is to provide you with an  
28          overview of some of the research findings.  
29          I'm not going to begin with an  
30          orientation of the Copper River, because  
31          everybody here knows where the Copper River  
32          is. Everybody knows a lot about the Copper  
33          River. Basically, the organization of the  
34          presentation begins with the purpose of  
35          progress, the geographic orientation, then I  
36          will go on to outline some of the recent  
37          trends of the Copper River Fishery looking  
38          at the preliminary results of the survey  
39          that we did. And the second part of the  
40          presentation will involve reporting on the  
41          traditional knowledge research. And we will  
42          go through the graphic context, methodology,  
43          and research findings.  
44          As you all -- and I wanted to  
45          start with basically what some of the trends  
46          that we found in the fishery itself were.  
47          We found the number of subsistence permits  
48          issued by area residents -- in other words,  
49          nonresident -- nonbasin permits are going  
50          up, as you can see by the red line there,

1 while the permits issued to basin residents  
are basically stacked. We also found in  
2 terms of the estimated total harvest of  
salmon that the harvest of nonbasin  
3 residents is going up, the harvest of Copper  
River basin residents is basically static,  
4 staying fairly level -- fairly level.

In our survey, we interviewed 509  
5 people. 382 of those were nonlocal  
residents; 127 of them were local people.

6 We went to the fisheries to do  
the interviews. In other words, we had  
7 somebody go out and actually talk to people  
while they were fishing. Many of the  
8 interviews took place down on the Chitina  
Subdistrict when people were using dip nets  
9 and at various fish camps.

Basically, what we did was we  
10 organized the data in terms of the customary  
and traditional use determinations. And  
11 everybody knows basically what they are, so  
I don't really -- I won't reiterate them.

12 And I will show you some of  
the -- what we learned. We basically  
13 learned that as everybody knows, the  
majority of locals use fishwheels and the  
14 majority of nonlocals use dip nets, so there  
is a real distinction between nonlocals and  
15 locals in terms of gear. As my data manager  
pointed out, all of the information we  
16 collected and the results show a  
statistically significant difference between  
17 locals and nonlocals.

Okay. For example, another  
18 variable we looked at, we looked at when  
people fished and we found that most  
19 nonlocals fish in July, most locals start  
fishing in June and then sort of peter out  
20 as the summer goes on. In other words, the  
intensity of fishing for the locals was  
21 usually in June, whereas intensity for  
fishing for the nonlocals is predominantly  
22 in July and very, very little in August and  
September. So there's differences there.

23 We also looked at how people  
prepared their fish. We found that  
24 nonlocals tend to prepare fish in a variety  
of different manners where most nonlocals, a  
25 great majority of nonlocals freeze or smoke  
their fish. There was a statistical



1 difference there in terms of how people  
2 prepared the fish depending on where they  
lived.

3 Okay. We did also ask people  
4 about how you learned how to fish. Here you  
can see that locals learn from their parents  
5 or other relatives, while nonlocals tended  
to learn -- either were self-taught or  
6 learned from a friend, usually people who  
they worked with. So there was a difference  
7 there. And that relates to the passing on  
of knowledge.

8 It tends -- the knowledge among  
9 locals tends to pass on from generation to  
generation from family member to family  
10 member. Nonlocals tend to pass on  
generation -- information through  
11 friendships and through nonrelatives.

12 Now, we asked the question about  
13 sharing harvests and we found that most  
nonlocals and locals share their harvest,  
14 but how locals share their harvest was  
different, and I haven't put any slides in  
15 here, but basically there were different  
patterns in terms of how the amounts were  
16 shared, who they shared with, and things  
like that. And this will all be in the  
17 report as well.

18 Okay. Then we looked at things  
19 like employment characteristics and tried to  
differentiate between locals and nonlocals  
20 and we found, as you can see, that  
nonlocals, majority of nonlocals were  
21 employed full-time, okay, whereas it was --  
the employment characteristics of local  
22 people was much more varied; some people  
being employed full-time but most being --  
23 also some being employed part-time and  
seasonal. So there was a difference there  
24 as well.

25 Now, one of the reasons that we  
did the survey was because we wanted to look  
26 at whether -- at whether or not there were  
differences between nonlocals and locals  
27 based -- or because of what the Board of  
Fish had done in 1999. In December of 1999  
28 they had made the dip net fishery which had  
been a personal use fishery, a subsistence  
29 fishery, and they based that -- I think one  
of their decisions on the fact that a number

1 of people had been involved in the dip net  
 2 fisheries from Fairbanks, especially for a  
 3 long, long time. So there was maybe this  
 4 notion that the locals and nonlocals had  
 5 sort of coalesced in terms of all their  
 6 characteristics that show that also they  
 7 haven't. That there are separations. The  
 8 thing I do want to point out is there was a  
 9 cadre of nonlocal dipnetters who had been  
 10 going down to Chitina to fish since the  
 11 '40s -- there is that small group. I think  
 12 the majority of the people we interviewed of  
 13 the 10,000 dipnetters are basically new  
 14 people. The small cadre of long-term  
 15 fishermen is pretty small. And this shows  
 16 that to some degree.

17 Okay. Then I would ask people  
 18 about whether they were satisfied with the  
 19 harvest limits and we got an affirmative in  
 20 all the groups that also we talked to. Most  
 21 people were satisfied with their harvest  
 22 limits.

23 We asked if their harvest had  
 24 gone down -- here you noticed and I divided  
 25 this out by Ahtna, other basin residents and  
 26 nonbasin residents. Ahtna and other basin  
 27 resident who also had been fishing for a  
 28 long time in the Copper River sort of looked  
 29 at this on a long-term basis and said their  
 30 harvest had gone down. People we  
 31 interviewed in the basin have very, very  
 32 long-term memories whereas nonbasin  
 33 residents have shorter memories, shorter  
 34 histories.

35 Now, I want to switch gears  
 36 here.

37 Are there any questions now?  
 38 If I'm talking too fast, please  
 39 stop me, I get nervous.

40 MR. JOHN: You did a good job.

41 MR. SIMEONE: The next part of  
 42 the project has to do with traditional  
 43 ecological knowledge. And I wanted to point  
 44 out that the key to this, we felt, the key  
 45 to learning about traditional ecological  
 46 knowledge was to know about the language.  
 47 Okay. We wanted to document what people  
 48 knew about their environment and about

1 salmon by talking to people in Ahtna.  
 Because we felt that they expressed  
 2 themselves better that way, much more  
 detailed amounts of information, just a lot  
 3 better way of gathering information about  
 what people knew.

4 I should point out that everybody  
 that we did talk to is bilingual. They  
 5 speak very good English and they speak  
 Ahtna, so the conversation was carried on  
 6 often in both languages.

As I said, we hired Dr. Carey who  
 7 has had 20 years of experience in the Copper  
 River Basin and has collected a lot of  
 8 information on the Ahtna language, including  
 making an Ahtna dictionary.

9 Together, Dr. Carey and I  
 conducted both directed and nondirected  
 10 interviews with nine Ahtna elders and a  
 middle-aged person. I'm not going to call  
 11 Wilson Justin an Elder just yet. The  
 interviews were transcribed, translated, and  
 12 then edited by a number of very good Ahtna  
 speakers for accuracy.

13 Okay. And these are some of the  
 research methods that we used, mostly just  
 14 going out and talking to people with a tape  
 recorder.

15 The traditional -- the  
 consultants that also we used are Frank  
 16 Billham who has since died, unfortunately,  
 Katie John, Virginia Pete, Frank Stickwan,  
 17 Andy Tylon.

Now, the interview topics  
 18 included -- we collected information on  
 salmon and other fish, we collected  
 19 information about the life history of  
 salmon, we collected information about  
 20 factors influencing the movement of salmon,  
 we -- information about harvest devices and  
 21 the preparation of salmon, and information  
 on the Ahtna management system, and then  
 22 legends and stories about salmon that people  
 knew.

23 In addition to the interviews, we  
 collected archival information which had  
 24 been -- from earlier research from the '50s  
 and '60s and from earlier than that. And  
 25 Dr. Carey transcribed, translated, edited  
 material that he had previously collected

1 from Katie John, including about a 30-page  
 2 narrative on the Tanana Fishery which is the  
 3 centerpiece for the whole report. It's a  
 4 very, very detailed narrative about her  
 5 experiences in the Tanana Fishery, and she  
 6 talked about things when she was a child.  
 7 She discussed for example, the detailed  
 8 construction of the fish weirs and the traps  
 9 that were used in Tanana Creek, the rules  
 10 associated with fishing and she noted that  
 11 there were very, very strict rules  
 12 associated with the people's behavior around  
 13 the fish weir and the traps.

14 She also discussed the amounts of  
 15 fish that they caught and what they needed  
 16 for people to make it through the winter.  
 17 She discussed the first salmon ceremony that  
 18 people had to perform if they wanted to have  
 19 luck for the whole next year, and she talked  
 20 a lot about the processing of fish products  
 21 and of making different kinds of products  
 22 including the use of copper wood sap mixed  
 23 with fish grease that I had never known  
 24 about. I thought it was interesting.

25 Her narratives are sort of the  
 centerpiece, but there are a lot of other  
 narratives that we collected from a number  
 of other Elders, but it was important to  
 collect these narratives to allow people to  
 express themselves in their own manner.

Okay. Then I would present just  
 a little bit of ethnographic background on  
 the Ahtna which most people already know.  
 The Ahtna territory was 23,000 square miles  
 with four dialects, Ahtna social  
 organization was matrilineal in the sense  
 that they are clans and that children  
 determine their descent through their  
 mother. One of the important things was the  
 political organization in which there's a  
 clan structure with a clan chief or clan  
 head and he is responsible for his people.  
 He is responsible for accumulating  
 subsistence foods and redistributing them  
 and he was important to the fishery because  
 he determined how much fish should be caught  
 for that year. He made sure that the weir  
 was -- or the dip net platforms were in good  
 working order. In other words, he was the  
 overseer to make sure that people collected

1 enough subsistence foods to live throughout  
the year, and to be able to trade with  
2 people in the surrounding area.

Okay. Now, I wanted to make sure  
3 that people understood that we're not just  
talking about the past here. In many  
4 respects we saw the Village Council was  
taking over the role of a clan leader and  
5 managing resources, and one example was in  
1996, the Ahtna Village Councils began to  
6 manage their own village fishwheels and  
these wheels are used to catch salmon that  
7 is distributed to Ahtna Elders and people  
who do not have access to the wheels. So  
8 there is -- I don't see any breakdown  
between the past and the present. I see  
9 some continuity. It's just the structures  
are changed. The people -- the Village  
10 Council -- where you had this clan leader,  
this individual, now you have a Village  
11 Council who does many of these things.

Then we did something on the  
12 traditional seasonal round which I won't go  
into.

And then we talked about the  
13 importance of fish. We did the ranking of  
14 fish as a food source for the Central and  
Lower Copper River. Sockeye salmon are the  
15 first. They were the major fish stored for  
the winter. We figured that they filled 40  
16 percent of the larder. Chinook were second  
with grayling and whitefish and then you had  
17 coho and round whitefish, rainbow trouts,  
and steelhead were also used. They were  
18 approximately 10 percent of the larder.  
Then you had bullhead and lamprey which were  
19 not at all. They were considered taboo.

If I made a mistake here, you  
20 guys up there, or people know, correct me.  
I don't know everything, I'm just....

And then we talked about Ahtna  
21 natural -- of the natural history of salmon,  
22 we looked at salmon, anolmaly, Ahtna  
knowledge of life cycle, the factors  
23 influencing the life cycle streams of salmon  
and the salmon environment.

Here we have a very basic picture  
of salmon, of Ahtna terms for both insides.  
25 There was a considerable amount of knowledge  
about the internal organs of fish and it was

1 quite interesting.

So this is one of the things.

2 Basically, then we had -- we  
talked about the distribution of salmon.

3 Now, I wanted to talk a little  
bit about that service. The Ahtna have  
4 terms for 19 species of fish that appear  
both inside and outside the basin. That  
5 includes all 14 species of fish found in the  
Copper River Basin that have been  
6 inventoried by the Alaska Department of Fish  
& Game and the National Parks Service. The  
7 Ahtna and scientific knowledge are  
comparable. They both know what's there.

8 There are five additional species  
that Ahtna recognized which includes, pike,  
9 pink salmon, chum salmon, whitefish, and  
hooligan. Because Ahtna live in the  
10 Matanuska Valley and some of the fish are  
there, also in trade.

11 There is also considerable  
elaboration in terms of the varieties of  
12 fish that are available. The Ahtna know a  
lot about homes, for example, different --  
13 what they call -- what the Department of  
Fish & Game call -- what the heck are they  
14 called? Not runs, but stocks of fish, okay.  
Basically, the upper Ahtna had recognized 21  
15 runs of stocks of fish, including chinook  
and sockeye salmon on the Upper Copper  
16 River. In other words, they have delineated  
21 different stocks that they know are  
17 separate, okay?

And these stocks are called --  
18 are discussed in terms of their home  
streams. And there are two that are very,  
19 very well known. There's one called Naktal  
Nuigska (ph.) which is roasted salmon fish,  
20 you guys know where that comes from.  
Batzulnetas, that fish is known throughout  
21 the whole Copper Basin, from Terrel to  
Batzulnetas. Everybody knows what that fish  
22 looks like and when it's coming through.

There's another fish that  
23 everybody knows called saslogya (ph.) which  
is translated as sand sockeye. This is from  
24 Sosleta Creek and Sosleta Lake. They knew  
about the chineme (ph.), Norooga (ph.),  
25 which is the -- that's the big king salmon,  
they say those are the really big king

1 salmon.

2 People had a pretty good idea of  
3 what's out there, you know, in terms of  
4 being able to identify it pretty precisely.

5 Now we also tried to understand  
6 the Ahtna self-management strategies. We  
7 looked and we basically -- I'll just read  
8 what I wrote. Traditionally salmon were a  
9 critical resource to the Ahtna because they  
10 were a major staple that arrived at a  
11 juncture in the annual cycle when food was  
12 scarce. Ahtna therefore developed  
13 strategies to manage and regulate the  
14 harvest of salmon.

15 Now, these self-management  
16 strategies such as those practiced by the  
17 Ahtna derive a legitimacy and authority from  
18 the community basically of knowledge and  
19 values and practices, so there's  
20 community-based versus a State system which  
21 basically springs from governmental or  
22 administrative authority. And in a  
23 self-management system the management is in  
24 the hands of the resource users who adhere  
25 to the rules for several reasons, once in  
response to social pressure and -- and/or  
because of religious conviction. We will  
see there's a certain religious aspect to  
the management system.

But people also know what will  
happen if they abuse the resource, okay?  
They understand that their actions do affect  
the animals, plants, and fish which they  
depend on.

So, in a self-management system,  
you have no institutional mechanisms to  
force compliance. And especially in Ahtna  
culture where the individual autonomy is so  
highly valued each adult was responsible for  
following the rules. That's what they were  
supposed to do. And there were certain  
things that could happen, for example, if  
somebody trespassed on a territory, there  
would be violence, there could be fighting  
over that. And children were severely  
reprimanded for not acting correctly or  
making disturbances around fishing sites.  
Basically the Ahtna practiced three  
strategies to control when and where the  
harvest of salmon took place, the amounts

1 they harvested and the size and condition of  
2 the fish that they caught. And these  
3 strategies included, okay, one, a system of  
4 territories and leadership which we sort of  
5 talked about a little bit, in which there  
6 were clan territories throughout the whole  
7 region. People didn't not only trespass on  
8 them, they had to ask permission to go.  
9 There were all sorts of rules involved in  
10 whether or not you could fish there, whether  
11 or not you had rights to fish there, et  
12 cetera. And the clan leaders were the basic  
13 managers or overseers.

14 Then you had basically a  
15 conservation imperative. You had the rules  
16 for fishing that kept a sustained yield.  
17 The practices for a sustained yield. Now  
18 the imperative was not to waste. Every  
19 Elder that we talked to talked about the  
20 fact that you are not to waste fish. It is  
21 basically a sin in their view to waste fish.

22 Then the other one was timing of  
23 the harvest and effort, and included in that  
24 is that you want to fish early in the  
25 season, you want to get your fish fast, as  
26 quickly as you can because of the fears of  
27 high water, problems with insects and  
28 problems with wet weather. So everything --  
29 and because the major product that people  
30 were after was dried fish and you had to get  
31 as much fish as you could in that early  
32 period up until about the middle of July,  
33 all kinds of different things kicked in.  
34 There are other things people did or  
35 collected different kinds of products.

36 People selected salmon on the  
37 basis of fish. They tended to throw out the  
38 females. One of the things people mentioned  
39 in terms of traditional dip net fishery was  
40 that you certainly monitor what you could  
41 catch a lot better than you could with a  
42 fishwheel. People were letting females go  
43 when they were catching them in a dip net,  
44 something that they can't do today as  
45 easily.

46 And then there was the other  
47 thing about harvesting the right amount and  
48 that people -- basically it was very  
49 important to get the right amount of fish to  
50 sustain you through the year.



1           Okay. One of the interesting  
2 things was that whereas that we found that  
3 Yupik tended not to want to count fish.  
4 They found that it was in a sense insulting  
5 to pay attention to the number of fish you  
6 caught. Well, Ahtna in our experience,  
7 anyway, were very, very conscious of the  
8 number of fish and they had developed this  
9 concept of the bale, and apparently -- what  
10 I've learned is that a bale of fish is  
11 either 42 or 40 sockeye or 20 chinook. But  
12 also I've learned just recently that bale --  
13 the number of fish in a bale also varied  
14 depending on family. And apparently a  
15 40-fish bale of sockeye is really something  
16 that has a measurement for trade purposes,  
17 that is the most sockeye that a man could  
18 lift and carry for a long distance. But  
19 everybody that we've talked to mentioned  
20 this bale as an important measurement.

21           We also tried to estimate the  
22 precontact harvest of salmon for Ahtna  
23 people. We figured it at a rough estimate  
24 of 1189 pounds per capita per use, that's  
25 1189 pounds of year of fish per person per  
use. That's a total of 1,308,450 pounds of  
fish or 327,000 sockeye salmon.

          Now, that's just what we figured  
for this bot. We didn't talk about fish  
that people ate just fresh or fermented fish  
or stuff like that.

          Now, that's way over what people  
collect today.

          Now, we figured and we also  
looked at why harvests have gone down. We  
tried to look at some of the historical  
problems that people have faced and why the  
harvest had been lowered, and one of them  
was the decline in population, the Ahtna  
population because of disease, ravages of  
disease, there was a commercial fishery at  
the mouth in -- within the Copper River at  
one time which had -- which didn't estimate  
the stocks, but it certainly lowered them  
way down.

          There were changes in  
regulations, changes in lifestyle. There  
were changes in environment coupled with the  
development of private property along the  
river which makes it very difficult if you

1   lose a fishwheel site, it's hard to find  
another one.

2         Okay. And so the river --  
changes of the river sometimes made it hard  
3   for people to continue to fish.

      Now, the other point is that the  
4   traditional management system is based on  
information that people get from experience  
5   and from observation, but the rules about  
what you do about fishing, how you act  
6   around fish, how you handle fish, you know,  
everything came from stories, came from  
7   information that people passed through  
stories, and we collected two of these  
8   stories. One is called Raven, Seagull, and  
Eagle. That story is about the genesis of  
9   salmon in the Copper River. The other was  
the book which is the salmon story, the one  
10   that's highly valued. It's a story about a  
boy who was captured by the salmon people,  
11   went to live with them, came back and was  
caught in a dip net and then became human  
12   again and told people what it was that the  
salmon -- how they wanted to be treated.

13   And in order -- and that these rules that he  
imparted to people basically are about the  
14   sustained fishery. You know, they're about  
how to keep the fishery up. And so these  
15   are very important stories that we collected  
that we learned. And some of the  
16   storytellers I wanted to -- Jake Tansy,  
Frank Stickwan, Fred Ewan, and the late  
17   Martha Jackson were people who told us some  
of these stories.

18         And then we collected information  
on salmon harvesting devices, the most  
19   prominant piece of equipment that people  
used in the past was the dip net, but that  
20   was used in the main stream of the Copper  
River. There was the disani (ph.) and that  
21   was the fish trap that was used, some of the  
side traps, there was a fish spear and then  
22   the fishwheel.

      Okay. We documented  
23   approximately 120 different dip net sites  
along the Copper River that were grouped  
24   into districts with large concentrations  
between Terrel, for example, at the mouth of  
25   the Tonsina and concentration up to the  
mouth of the Chitina, one around present

1 Copper Center, Gulkana Creek, in those  
2 areas, very few dipnet sites above the  
3 Chistochina, the mouth of the Chistochina.  
4 A few up that way.

5 The major weir sites were on the  
6 tributaries of the Copper River, Tanana  
7 Creek, weir site on the Gulkana as well as  
8 the sites tended to be where the lake and  
9 the stream came together. There were two  
10 different kinds of traps. There was a trap  
11 that was put in the weir, but there was also  
12 a reverse current trap, downstream of the  
13 weir if the fish went up to the trap and  
14 didn't go in, they would go back downstream  
15 and be caught with a trap that was further  
16 downstream. It was designed differently in  
17 order to catch these fish coming back  
18 downstream.

19 And then we collected information  
20 about the fish camp and the processing of  
21 salmon. These are just pictures, and then  
22 we looked at basically the major products  
23 which the first I said was dried fish. Then  
24 there was fermented salmon, and fermented  
25 salmon is the process of two different  
26 styles, short term and long term. Fish  
27 grease which is used -- very important to  
28 dry the backbones of salmon. Then people  
29 ate salmon fresh. So we learned quite a bit  
30 about that.

31 Now, what I wanted to talk about,  
32 two things here: When I gave this  
33 presentation to you for Fish and Wildlife  
34 Service years ago I was asked if I planned  
35 to make any recommendations. I didn't plan  
36 to make recommendations out of research.  
37 That startled me. I'm not used to making  
38 recommendations to anybody, even my children  
39 don't even listen to me. I don't expect  
40 anybody else to.

41 (Laughter.)

42 MR. SIMEONE: One of my most  
43 important concerns was to make this  
44 information available to managers and  
45 biologists, okay? I'm hoping that the  
46 information, that the report isn't sort of  
47 dismissed, I mean by people and I don't  
48 think they'll really do that. I don't want

1 it to be another anthropological historical  
2 interest report that has been produced and  
3 people don't use. I basically have come up  
4 with three tentative recommendations. One  
5 is that U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Subsistence,  
6 and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game,  
7 come up with a working group that includes  
8 Natives and non-Native experts to talk about  
9 this information, about new research  
10 information, and research about salmon. To  
11 tap into Ahtna Elders' information about  
12 salmon, which is much more diverse and  
13 elaborate than anything I've told you so  
14 far.

15 I thought it was important that  
16 we use the information to develop long-term  
17 management goals and Larry Buklis, he sort  
18 of gave me that idea. And then to develop  
19 further research questions as well.

20 And then what -- what we're  
21 trying to do now is trying to finish this  
22 report by updating all the graphs and tables  
23 that we have compiled from earlier research  
24 to continue to collect more information,  
25 starting to learn more information about  
26 what people know about how salmon actually  
27 guide themselves up the river. And then I  
28 want -- and then we're also continuing to do  
29 research on non-salmon species in the Copper  
30 River, doing the same sort of research with  
31 traditional knowledge, but also doing a  
32 harvest survey that will be about 500  
33 residents of the basin.

34 So, that's what I had to say, I  
35 guess.

36 Are there any questions?

37 MR. LOHSE: You must have quite a  
38 stack of paper?

39 MR. SIMEONE: Quite a stack of  
40 paper. I've got eight chapters so far.

41 MR. LOHSE: Are you going to put  
42 this all in an organized -- I mean, all  
43 these different sections so that they're  
44 available to be read?

45 MR. SIMEONE: Yes. That's right.

1           MR. LOHSE: Everything from the  
research to the stories to the --

2  
3           MR. SIMEONE: Yeah. There's a  
whole chapter just on -- that has all of the  
versions of the stories we collected.  
4       They're both in Ahtna and translated in  
English. Katie John's story which covers  
5       just one whole chapter itself, 30 pages long  
which is lingual translation of her Ahtna  
6       into English.

7       The "Ahtna Management" chapter  
covers everything I talked about here more  
but it also has all the Ahtna -- all the  
8       Elders' discussions in Ahtna translated into  
English. So, yeah, there's quite a bit of  
9       information.

10          MR. LOHSE: I think that would be  
well worthwhile. Then some of the things  
11       that we've dealt with in the past, we had to  
deal with are things that if some of that  
12       stuff would have been taken into  
consideration would never have been on the  
13       table. Because if consideration would have  
been given to things like that in the past,  
14       it's possible we would be farther along.

15          MR. SIMEONE: I apologize we  
didn't get this done sooner.

16

17          MR. LOHSE: Two years ago.

18          MR. SIMEONE: That was Wilson's  
comment, why didn't we have this in 1970?

19

20          MR. LOHSE: I'm glad to hear that  
it's going to be available for managers or  
21       people that sit in the same kind of  
positions as we do. People in general that  
22       are interested in learning about other  
people. It can be a tremendous -- be a  
23       tremendous additional high school course for  
the high schools in the Basin.

24

25          MR. SIMEONE: Yeah, yeah.  
Hopefully it can be used in education.

1           MR. LOHSE: Any other comments or  
questions?  
2           Roy?

3           MR. EWAN: I just have a comment  
and it's a good one. I think you did a very  
4   fine job. I really appreciate what you've  
done -- what you've done. I hope you  
5   continue to do it. I think that's going to  
be very valuable for people that are not  
6   familiar with the past in the Ahtna area and  
probably if you're doing it in other areas,  
7   I think you did a fine job. Thank you.

8           MR. SIMEONE: Thank you very  
much.

9           MR. EWAN: I did have one other  
10   question. One picture shown, I'm familiar  
with that picture. Did you ever find out  
11   what year that was?

12          MR. SIMEONE: No. I've got to go  
to the museum. About the woman --

13          MR. EWAN: Yes.

14          MR. SIMEONE: I've got to find  
15   out.

16          MR. EWAN: Quite a while ago.

17          MR. SIMEONE: Yeah, oh, yeah.  
1900.

18          MR. LOHSE: Any other questions?

19          MR. JOHN: I just want to say I  
20   appreciate your presentation. I think it's  
good to have and hope you just continue to  
21   get all the information.

22          MR. SIMEONE: Thanks, Fred.

23          MR. LOHSE: Ida?

24          MS. HILDEBRAND: Excuse me.  
Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ida Hildebrand,  
25   since TEK is an interest of all the regional  
councils, are you planning to do a

1 presentation at any of the regional  
councils?

2 MR. SIMEONE: I hadn't planned on  
3 it.

4 MS. HILDEBRAND: Would you  
consider it?

5 MR. SIMEONE: Sure.

6

7 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, that was  
absolutely fascinating, and probably, yeah,  
8 it should have been done a long time ago.  
But it'll probably be some of the most  
9 meaningful information that we will have.  
And think about doing presentations, okay?

10

11 MR. SIMEONE: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. LOHSE: Okay. With that, I  
sure thank you for your presentation.  
I think we're going to take a  
13 five-minute break.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. LOHSE: And we will try and  
cut this one to five minutes. We'll cut it  
16 to five minutes because we're going to see  
how much we can get through with Doug's  
17 presentation and the deliberations that also  
we have to make about this.

18

19 (Recess taken.)

20 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I  
guess I don't know that you're off track.  
Basically, what you heard were a lot more  
21 detailed presentations of some of the work  
that's being funded through this program,  
22 so, I don't know if it was off track at all,  
more detailed presentation than the general  
23 overview which I'm prepared to do.  
Okay. The last part of this  
24 presentation is on the Draft Resource  
Monitoring Plan for 2002. So what we've  
25 talked about so far is results and progress  
from work that's already been funded in the

1 years 2000 and 2001 and now there's an  
2 opportunity to fund some additional work in  
3 the coming year, 2002. So what I'm going to  
4 be speaking to and the handouts that you  
5 received, there's another handout that's  
6 entitled "The 2002 Fishery Resource  
7 Monitoring Plan Review Draft for the Cook  
8 Inlet Gulf of Alaska Region." And this is  
9 the talking points for the report under Tab  
10 E in your book. Tab E in your book has a  
11 lot more detailed information which includes  
12 executive summary and individual reviews of  
13 individual projects.

14 I'll give them a minute to make  
15 sure they've got it. Everybody got the  
16 right paperwork?

17 Again, the talking points that  
18 we'll actually be going through is in the  
19 handout on the 2002 Draft Resources  
20 Monitoring Plan.

21 I don't know if there's any point  
22 in repeating the purpose. We're going to  
23 review and discuss the proposal that also  
24 we've received and staff recommendation for  
25 what is to be funded in 2002. The detailed  
information is under Tab E, and at the end  
of this presentation, we are very much  
looking for review, recommendations, and  
advice on the part of the Council for  
funding recommendations.

26 The agenda -- what I'm going to  
27 speak to here in the next few minutes, I  
28 think we can very, very quickly go through  
29 the background for the Fishery Resources  
30 Monitoring Program. We did that in the  
31 previous presentation. I will briefly kind  
32 of go through, remind everyone on the study  
33 selection process that has occurred to date.

34 Then we'll go through the Draft 2002 Fishery  
35 Resource Monitoring Plan for this region.

36 Again, we can just very briefly touch on the  
37 issues, information needs and then I'll go  
38 through the stock status and trend projects  
39 and the harvest money TEK programs, at the  
40 end we'll go through the review, discussion  
41 and your advice and recommendations.

42 In the interest of time, I'm  
43 going to pass through the financial  
44 information. The only thing I'll mention is  
45 again on this bar graph, from a Statewide



1 perspective what we're going to be talking  
2 about are the portions of bars that have the  
3 numbers in them. That's the amount of  
4 money. If you go to 2002, the very middle  
5 bar, there's a little over \$2 million to  
6 fund new work statewide in this program.

7 MR. LOHSE: Statewide. Do we  
8 have any breakdown as to what that would be  
9 to our area?

10 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes. In this  
11 region there is a formula that's used as a  
12 guideline. Kind of get the discussion going  
13 and that formula breaks things out by  
14 region. So, for this region, I think the  
15 exact amount is \$291,000 or roughly --

16 MR. LOHSE: Basically \$300,000.

17 MR. MCBRIDE: 300,000, exactly.  
18 The other thing that's pertinent, the  
19 recommendation that you're going to get is  
20 based on taking two thirds of that money,  
21 roughly 200,000 out of 300,000, putting it  
22 into stock status and trends work and taking  
23 about a third of the money or \$100,000 and  
24 putting that into the harvest monitoring,  
25 TEK work. That's our starting point for  
making a recommendation.

On the study selection process,  
again, the Fishery Information Services  
staff, NOSM, we -- that's part of our job,  
we provide the oversight for that process.

The recommendations that I'm going to  
present to you are actually the product of  
what's called the Inter-agency Technical  
Review Committee and that's a group of  
biological and social scientists,  
professionals from the various agencies.

And there is an Inter-agency Technical  
Review Committee, and the recommendations  
that I'm going to give you are their  
recommendations, and when the FIS staff and  
the Technical Review Committee look at these  
project proposals, we judge them on several  
criteria, and those criteria are: Strategic  
priorities, how well do they match the

1 priorities set by the Council and the  
Federal Subsistence Board.

2 Then we also try to judge them on  
the technical and scientific merit. How  
3 well from a methodology standpoint do they  
propose doing what they say they're going to  
4 do? Then we also look at the past  
performance of the investigators, trying to  
5 make sure that we're dealing with people  
that we can deal with on kind of a  
6 cooperative agreement or contractual basis,  
and then finally we look at the partnership  
7 and capacity-building aspects of the  
program. And along those lines, there are  
8 tables in this report under Tab E, back at  
tables -- it's Table 1 and 2 in this  
9 section, the tables that look like this.  
They're on page 12 and 13. We tried to put  
10 some definition of what that really means on  
partnership and capacity building. And  
11 what's in these tables is for every project  
that we had under consideration we looked at  
12 two financial things. We looked at what  
portion of their budget is going towards  
13 local hire, and we put a very definite  
definition on local hire, but we asked  
14 everybody that submitted a proposal and a  
budget to tell us what portion of that  
15 budget, how much money was going to go to  
local hire, and we defined local hire. And  
16 we also look at how much of the budget was  
going to what we call NGOs and that's  
17 Federal I for nongovernment organization.  
Okay. That means somebody besides the State  
18 or the Federal Government, okay?

So we try to look at those two  
19 aspects and get how much money people are  
really talking about going to somebody  
20 besides the State or the Federal Governments  
and how much money is going to go to local  
21 hire. So when we talk about partnership and  
capacity-building that's what we were  
22 primarily looking at.

Okay. On the -- again, I'm going  
23 to again, briefly discuss the issues and  
information needs, and in the previous  
24 presentation we already discussed that, I  
don't want to go into a lot of detail on  
25 that, but I am going to come back and  
revisit that at the very end of the

1 discussion, because I think we need to have  
 2 some discussion about where Cook Inlet fits  
 3 into this mix. But for purposes of what I'm  
 4 going to present right now, what we  
 5 primarily focused on is the primary issues  
 6 and information needs are the issues of the  
 7 Copper River and Prince William Sound.

8 Okay. For the stock status and  
 9 trends projects, these are projects and  
 10 proposals that we received for 2002, the TRC  
 11 looked at all the proposals that we got last  
 12 November -- let me just quickly revisit that  
 13 selection process. There was a call for  
 14 proposals last November, proposals were due  
 15 into us by last February. We reviewed those  
 16 proposals with the Technical Review  
 17 Committee, and we selected certain proposals  
 18 that had a full-blown investigation plan  
 19 prepared. And it's those investigation  
 20 plans that are now under consideration.

21 Of those projects, the stock  
 22 status and trends projects, four of them  
 23 were advanced for investigation plan and of  
 24 all four of these projects, all these  
 25 projects did address issues that were  
 26 identified by the Advisory Council, all of  
 27 those SST projects sought to better estimate  
 28 fish abundance. They're all salmon  
 29 projects, all four of them, however I think  
 30 what you're going to find as we go through  
 31 each of the individual projects, the  
 32 different strategic importance and technical  
 33 merit and their opportunity for capacity  
 34 building, and in total, these four projects  
 35 total almost \$400,000. So if you look at it  
 36 from the standpoint that's \$300,000 to  
 37 point, we -- 200,000 to spend, we clearly  
 38 need to make a selection. We can't afford  
 39 them all.

40 What I'm going through now is  
 41 Table 3 in this packet. It's also Table 3  
 42 in your book, which is found on page 14,  
 43 page 14 under Tab E, the same table.

44 And these were four stock status  
 45 and trends projects. What I'm going to do  
 46 is just very briefly go through each one of  
 47 these and explain the rationale. Now, if  
 48 you look at this, let's just talk about the  
 49 table for a second. It's very similar to  
 50 the table we looked at in the previous

1 presentation. Over on the left-hand side is  
2 just the accounting number that we used to  
3 keep track of projects. The next column are  
4 titles, and then the next column are our  
5 recommendations or the Technical Review  
6 Committee's recommendations for funding, and  
7 then on the far right is the budget  
8 information for those projects.

9 And if you look at this, let's  
10 just go right to the recommendations:  
11 There's four projects here. We only  
12 recommended one project for funding and it's  
13 the bottom one on the page, Project 15,  
14 Migratory Timing and Spawning Distribution  
15 for Spawning in the Copper River, Project  
16 15; why we recommended this project over the  
17 others. We talked about this project real  
18 briefly earlier here today. This is the  
19 radio tagging project that the Chairman was  
20 asking about. This is a project that adds  
21 on to the existing Native Village of Eyak  
22 project, estimated total abundance of king  
23 salmon in the Copper River. And what this  
24 project would do is radio tag a portion of  
25 those fish that they're catching in those  
lower fishwheels that Bruce Cain and Michael  
Link talked to you about. They put radio  
tags on that project and then they would  
track those fish further up the river, and  
they would be very directly getting the  
information as Ralph asked Michael and Bruce  
about, spawning distribution, you know, the  
various locations that those spawning fish  
go.

18 So, our view of this is if we do  
19 this add-on, it really makes for a complete  
20 package. The existing project that we're  
21 funding is going to give us a total estimate  
22 of abundance past the commercial fishery,  
23 coming up the Copper River, and then this  
24 part is that estimate. It would break the  
25 estimate up to the various locations or  
spawning stocks where they're going.

This is a Fish & Game project.  
23 It does have NVE, Native Village of Eyak is  
24 a co-investigator on this project. And it's  
25 an expensive project. In fact, it would  
basically take up all the money that is  
available. That's really driving our  
recommendation in that it really directly

1 speaks to what we perceive as the major  
2 issue. Certainly it's very good as far as  
3 technical merit. It does have a partnership  
4 and capacity-building component to it,  
5 and -- if you accept this as our  
6 recommendation, then the math will eliminate  
7 or not -- will preclude funding any of the  
8 other work. So let's talk about the other  
9 work and discuss it on the merits.

10 Project 158 now going back up to  
11 the top, stock assessment of salmon in the  
12 select Prince William Sound waters. When  
13 Patty Brown-Schwalenberg was here, this is  
14 one of the projects she spoke to you about.  
15 This is one of the projects that was in  
16 front of you last year, what it would do is  
17 funding two weirs on salmon stocks in Prince  
18 William Sound. We recommended this for  
19 funding last year. It's based on your  
20 recommendation that we did not fund this  
21 project. And from a technical standpoint  
22 the project is identical to what we looked  
23 at last year. It's a weir project, it's  
24 very doable. The only thing that changes on  
25 this project, Patty spoke to this, the  
Department of Fish & Game went back to both  
Chenega and Tatitlek and Chugach on the  
regional corporation that Patty represents  
and they had built a partnership and  
capacity-building aspect into this project  
so they did what was asked in view of the  
Technical Review Committee which -- what  
you're dealing with is relative importance  
of issues. You know, trying to stack the  
issues of too small sockeye stocks up in  
Prince William Sound against trying to get a  
more complete picture of king salmon  
abundance in the Copper River. That's  
really what the difference in the projects  
is.

The next project, 074, Alaganik  
Slough coho salmon escapement. Again, even  
though this is listed as an 02 project, it's  
basically a project that was in front of you  
last year. This is a project that's being  
proposed by the Forest Service. We had some  
technical concerns with it last year. They  
addressed those concerns. That's why it's  
got a new project number with it and it does  
what it says. It would look at and assist

1 the escape of coho salmon in Alaganik  
2 Slough, which is a system in the Copper  
3 River Delta, very close to Cordova. It has  
4 capacity, partnership building. It has  
5 technical merits. Again, it's an issue of  
6 how does that stack up with trying to get a  
7 more complete picture of a larger Copper  
8 River salmon, Copper River king salmon  
9 issue.

10 The final project, 76, is  
11 actually very easy. That was withdrawn. It  
12 was kind of supplemental to Project 158, but  
13 for all intents and purposes we have three  
14 stock status projects in front of us. We're  
15 recommending that one of them, Project 15 be  
16 funded. I think I'll end here and take some  
17 questions.

18 MR. LOHSE: Doug, I guess since,  
19 you know, this is a -- you know, what we're  
20 looking at is four projects that have impact  
21 on subsistence resources. I was just  
22 basically looking at the three that you  
23 have -- that you have in front of us right  
24 here. And, you know, other than -- there's  
25 no major subsistence take of salmon up the  
26 Alaganik. It's basically what we're dealing  
27 with there is basically sport fishing  
28 impact. The assessment of salmon in the  
29 Prince William Sound waters, again, we're  
30 not dealing with a number of subsistence  
31 users involved or the impact to both  
32 subsistence users and communities, rural  
33 communities. We're looking at a migratory  
34 timing of the chinook, I mean, because that  
35 impacts both the rural community of Cordova  
36 and all of the subsistence users upriver and  
37 the subsistence users downriver.

38 I guess I would have to -- I  
39 would have to say that if we're going to  
40 take them on their impact on subsistence  
41 users, I would have to say that I'd have to  
42 go along with migratory timing of chinook as  
43 being of much greater importance than how  
44 many cohos go up Gulkana or even how many  
45 sockeyes go into too small systems in Prince  
46 William Sound.

47 So, I could see if you take -- do  
48 you take that into account with these other  
49 criteria that you use, do you take into

1 account the impact on how many subsistence  
users this has an importance to?

2

MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, even  
3 though we don't enumerate the subsistence  
users, yes, we do. When we talk about  
4 strategic priorities, that's -- you said it  
perfectly. That's exactly the kind of  
5 analysis we go through when we look at what  
these -- what issues these projects are  
6 proposing to look at, and clearly a major  
part of it is how many subsistence users are  
7 being impacted; what kinds of issues are in  
front of the Council; what kind of issues  
8 are in front of the Board; are there  
regulatory issues, in-season management  
9 issues, when we talk about strategic issues.  
That's exactly what we're talking about.

10

MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
11 Any other questions, Roy?

12 MR. EWAN: I'm trying to  
understand the proposed budgets. Is this  
13 like on the chinook salmon for 2002 to 2004,  
that you're recommending just Federal moneys  
14 we're talking about here or just -- is there  
some other money from the other agencies  
15 involved in this?

16 MR. MCBRIDE: No, what we're  
talking about here is just Federal money.  
17 This is money --

18 MR. EWAN: I have a follow-up  
question. What are the other agencies'  
19 portion of it, that you're in partnership  
with?

20

MR. MCBRIDE: For this project  
21 specifically, we would basically be funding  
virtually the entire project. However, in  
22 this particular case, the primary  
investigator is the Alaska Department of  
23 Fish & Game, they have a lot of existing  
radio-tracking equipment and they also have  
24 permanent staff that they're going to apply  
to this. So, there is -- there are other  
25 as -- financial aspects of this project that  
they're contributing to.

1 I think the way we termed it in  
2 our analysis is we're leveraging their  
3 expertise and leveraging their previous  
investment of radio- tracking equipment.

4 MR. LOHSE: Doug, this will also  
5 be making use -- part of this will be going  
6 to the Native Village of Eyak, because it  
7 will be making use of the equipment that  
8 they're trying to put in place to enable  
9 this project to take place, won't it? I  
10 mean, it's -- Fish & Game is not going to be  
operating the fishwheels or furnishing the  
fishwheels or anything like that? They're  
basically going to be doing the radio part  
of it with fish that are already being taken  
with equipment that the Native Village of  
Eyak is putting in?

11 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman,  
12 that's exactly correct. The existing  
13 project, fishwheel project that Bruce and  
14 Michael talked about is sort of the  
15 platform, if you will, the basis. They're  
16 using those fishwheels to capture fish, so  
17 what would happen here is Department of Fish  
& Game would provide funding for -- in the  
18 Village of Eyak to local hire additional  
people, additional staff to chance -- to put  
radio tags on some of the king salmon that  
they catch at their fishwheels. So you're  
exactly correct. It's an add-on to that  
project and an add-on to that effort.

19 MR. LOHSE: So it -- so if I  
20 understand right, basically, it won't be the  
21 Fish & Game putting the tags and everything,  
22 they'll be training and providing -- and  
23 providing expertise, and the funding so that  
the Native Village of Eyak can hire people  
that are necessary to do the tagging, things  
like that; am I right?

24 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, you're exactly  
25 correct. Then in addition to that, then  
what Fish & Game would do, obviously the  
fish got tracked once they leave the site,  
they would be the primary people to keep



1 track of those fish further upriver, that  
2 tracking is going to go on way upriver.

3 MR. LOHSE: That's basically  
4 tracking with radios and airplanes?

5 MR. MCBRIDE: Both airplanes and  
6 what they call stationary data loggers.

7 MR. LOHSE: Radio receivers at  
8 the mouths of creeks and things like that?

9 MR. MCBRIDE: (Nods head.)

10 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions?  
11 Fred?

12 MR. ELVSASS: As I understand it  
13 you're going to use the same fishwheels  
14 that's in the ongoing program too?

15 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes.

16 MR. ELVSASS: I guess they belong  
17 to Eyak, right?

18 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes.

19 MR. ELVSASS: And that project is  
20 still ongoing, it's funded through 2000 --

21 MR. MCBRIDE: 2003.

22 MR. ELVSASS: This money will be  
23 on top of this money. So it will be doing  
24 the catch and release tagging as well as  
25 doing the radio monitoring?

26 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, Fred, that is  
27 exactly correct. So what we get out of it,  
28 the original project will give a total  
29 estimate of how many kings are in the Copper  
30 River, but it doesn't tell us anything about  
31 where those kings are going other than they  
32 went past the commercial fishery, they went  
33 past Miles Lake, now they're in the Copper  
34 River. The radio tagging will tell us where  
35 in the Copper River those fish are going.

1 Let's just say for the sake of arguments,  
2 they estimate there's 40,000 kings that got  
3 into the Copper River, then this radio  
4 tagging project would then be able to say,  
5 okay, 20 percent of them went into the  
6 Gulkana River and 14 percent went somewhere  
7 else. It would -- part is that total  
8 estimate.

9 MR. ELVSASS: And I think that's  
10 great, but if you just discounted the  
11 tagging program, just use the radio collar,  
12 wouldn't you get the same information? What  
13 good would a tagging do along with the radio  
14 collar? Are you talking about doing the two  
15 things to one fish or two different fish?

16 MR. MCBRIDE: The estimate  
17 abundance, original project we're talking  
18 about is primarily using very cheap,  
19 inexpensive tags. What they're putting on  
20 there is a spaghetti tag, just a piece of  
21 plastic. And the estimate is based on they  
22 capture so many fish at the lower site,  
23 that's what they did down in Bear Canyon,  
24 what Michael talked about they resampled the  
25 running further up the river, running  
26 fishwheels and dip nets further up the  
27 river. It becomes a ratio thing. They look  
28 at the total number of fish that they're  
29 looking in the upper river site. Some  
30 portion of those will have the marks, the  
31 tags on them that forms the basis of  
32 estimating the abundance. The radio  
33 transmitters, very expensive, is a piece of  
34 plastic, as opposed to a radio, certain  
35 battery life, much, much more expensive.  
36 Some of the fish will be outfitted with  
37 radio transmitters --

38 MR. ELVSASS: Some of them?

39 MR. MCBRIDE: Those fish, every  
40 one of them will be tracked, so there is no  
41 ratio of those fish. It's just a tracking  
42 exercise to figure out where they go.

43 MR. ELVSASS: Okay. I understand  
44 now. I just thought you were going to do  
45 the same thing to any fish. It didn't

1 match. But I know the radio program in the  
2 fish was very good in the Anchor River on  
the steelhead. Thanks.

3 MR. LOHSE: Doug?

4 MR. MCBRIDE: We're not that  
cruel.

5 MR. LOHSE: What?

6 MR. MCBRIDE: We're not that  
7 cruel.

8 MR. LOHSE: Could I just out of  
curiosity, this program would be totally  
9 cost prohibitive if we didn't have the other  
program already in place, wouldn't it?

10 MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely. It's  
11 adding on to the investment that this  
program has already made.

12 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

13 So, I mean if we don't do it at  
this point in time with the program that's  
14 in place, we'll probably never be able to  
afford to do this?

15 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, I would say  
16 that's very likely.

17 MR. ELVSASS: I have one more  
question.

18 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Fred.

19 MR. ELVSASS: Okay. Looking at  
20 the funding, the funding of 229,000 for this  
year, and that basically eats up all the  
21 available funds, then next year you have to  
come and get the 185 or is there a  
22 commitment right on through? How does this  
go? You see what I'm saying?

23 MR. MCBRIDE: I see exactly what  
24 you're saying. And it's an exercise, and  
the easiest way to explain it is the amount  
25 of money does not change every year, okay?  
But for the vast majority of these projects,

1 the subsequent year budgets typically are  
2 less than the first year, and the reason for  
3 that is because there's a lot of start-up  
4 costs, like the chinook tagging project is a  
5 good example. They had to build the  
6 fishwheels. In the subsequent years they  
7 don't have to rebuild the fishwheels,  
8 hopefully not, but it's that kind of stuff.

9 In addition to that, we try to  
10 reserve a third of the money for new work in  
11 the subsequent year. So we're making a  
12 conscious effort to not spend everything  
13 that we've got in year one, otherwise there  
14 would be nothing to spend in year two.

15 MR. LOHSE: So, basically, Doug,  
16 what you're saying is when we fund it for  
17 this year, we're actually funding it for  
18 three years.

19 MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely, yeah.  
20 If you end up in agreement with this  
21 recommendation, this would be the commitment  
22 that we would have to that project. If you  
23 remember that bar graph and how those bars  
24 declined over time for any particular year,  
25 I mean those are the commitments for the  
projects that are being funded.

Okay. I think what I'll do now  
is move into the harvest monitoring and the  
TEK projects. I'm going to be speaking to  
Table 4 which is on page 15 under Tab E of  
your book, and, again, there were four  
projects that were advanced for  
investigation plan, and in this case, and  
the available amount of money, remember we  
reserved about \$100,000 to funding harvest  
monitoring, TEK work, that was about a third  
of the total, \$300,000 budget we had to deal  
with for new work in 2002, and here all of  
these projects are addressing legitimate  
issues identified by the Council and by the  
Board. In one case, in the case of Project  
76, there are some technical concerns with a  
portion of that project.

If you look at all these projects  
together, they total about \$200,000. Again,  
we've got to do some selection here. We  
can't afford to do all the work.

1           Technical Review Committee here  
2 recommended funding three of these four  
3 projects. And they're the three projects in  
4 bold, the last three projects on your list,  
5 and that middle project, Project 28, the  
6 "Chugach Region Resource Data," the template  
7 for TEK. Patty Brown-Schwalenberg spoke to  
8 you about that when she was up here a little  
9 while ago. That contains a portion of the  
10 project we didn't recommend for funding that  
11 the Technical Review Committee thought did  
12 have technical merits and was on the mark as  
13 far as a strategic priority, so we've  
14 incorporated the part of Project 76 that we  
15 weren't recommending for funding in this  
16 project that the Technical Review Committee  
17 agreed with.

18           So, again, I'll just very briefly  
19 go through these projects. Two of these  
20 projects address Copper River issues and  
21 that's Project 75, which is the "Eulachon  
22 Subsistence Harvest Opportunities" and then  
23 Project 77, "Increasing GIS Capabilities in  
24 the Upper Copper River." The third project,  
25 Project 28 that I just spoke to contains a  
portion of Project 76 that was not  
recommended for funding. All of these  
projects contain significant budget  
components for nongovernment organizations  
or NGOs and for local hire.

16           I think in the interest of time,  
17 Mr. Chairman, I won't go through each one of  
18 these projects individually unless you want  
19 me to.

20           MR. LOHSE: Doug --

21           MR. ELVSASS: We won't have time.  
22 What time do we got?

23           MR. LOHSE: We don't have to  
24 leave here at 5:00 o'clock.

25           MR. MCBRIDE: I'm sorry.

            MR. LOHSE: We don't have to be  
out of here at 5:00 tonight, do we?

            MS. WILKINSON: No.

1  
2 MR. LOHSE: Give us just a quick,  
3 at least a summary on them. I think I  
4 understand pretty much what these projects  
5 are because I read them, but just a quick  
6 summary on them, Doug, and -- Doug, and  
7 anything that you think is pertinent on  
8 them.

9 MR. MCBRIDE: I think what I'll  
10 do is I'll concentrate on projects we've  
11 recommended, the one that Patty  
12 Brown-Schwalenberg just spoke about. It's  
13 got a mapping component. It's got a  
14 component where it's going to be collecting  
15 TEK information from some of the Chugach  
16 Region villages, the Elders in those  
17 villages, and it combines them into --  
18 through a GIS process into a database that's  
19 usable and it would be similar kinds of  
20 information, at least from a -- you know,  
21 similar types of information Bill Simeone  
22 just spoke with you about.

23 Project 75, the "Eulachon  
24 Subsistence Harvest Opportunities."  
25 Eulachon in the Copper River was kind of a  
hot topic this spring. There was a request  
for special action on the Eulachon return to  
the Copper River, and this project would  
fund harvest monitoring work on the  
Eulachon, trying to get much more detailed  
and contemporary information on what's the  
Eulachon use in the Copper River.

And then the last project,  
Project 77, "Increasing GIS Capabilities in  
the Upper Copper River," I believe this is a  
CRNA project. God, I hope so. I'm pretty  
sure that it is. I'd have to look it up  
here. I just can't remember off the top of  
my head. I'm pretty sure it is, though.

Again, this is getting at taking  
the existing information, putting it into a  
GIS format, which is basically a mapping  
format, you can look at the information  
visually, instead of having to look at all  
the data.

I'll check that real quick and  
ask if you have any questions.

MR. LOHSE: Any questions?

1

MR. MCBRIDE: It is a CRNA project.

3

MR. LOHSE: All of these have partnership and capability building?

5

MR. MCBRIDE: As you can see for all the projects, we put down how much local hire and how much goes to a NGO. In the last project, Project 77 --

7

MR. ELVSASS: What page are you on?

9

MR. MCBRIDE: I'm on page 12 in the report.

10

In this particular case, I mean, for 2002, it's -- you know, it's not a huge budget. It's 14,600, but the entire budget is going to CRNA, so by our definition, 100 percent of that budget is going to a nongovernment organization. None of it's going to a State or Federal agency. That's how you look at these tables.

14

Mr. Chairman, before we get into any final recommendations or advice on the part of the Council, there's one other issue we need to go through. Earlier what I said was the way the TRC looked at this is we looked at the Copper -- really the Copper River issues and to a lesser extent Prince William Sound issues driving the strategic priorities in these projects. We very systematically categorically excluded any new Cook Inlet work. That was because at the time this was going on, rural determination, the issue had not been resolved. It wasn't clear what was going to happen. We went through the action last February. I think everyone was in agreement.

22

Yesterday at the start of the regulatory discussion, Tom Boyd talked about the staff recommendation from a regulatory standpoint of how staff is going to be trying to deal with the Cook Inlet regulatory issues, and I think to summarize the pertinent points as it relates to the

25

1 funding program, I think what he said was  
2 the staff right now is recommending  
3 establishing subsistence fisheries at Cook  
4 Inlet based on existing sport fishing  
5 regulations as a first step, and the  
6 subsequent steps would be information-based.

7 Okay?

8 That means go collect  
9 information. Well, this is the program that  
10 collects information.

11 And so, I guess the question we  
12 would pose to the Council is: This entire  
13 draft plan we just spent the last 20 minutes  
14 talking about, didn't take that into  
15 account. We were operating under the  
16 paradigm, if you will, that Cook Inlet was  
17 still an unknown to us, but now -- there's  
18 actually a very clear recommendation for the  
19 work to be done in Cook Inlet, the next most  
20 important work in Cook Inlet is to go  
21 collect harvest use and needs information.  
22 That's harvest monitoring work. That's  
23 where it would fit in this program.

24 So, the question that we have for  
25 the Council and what we're looking for a  
recommendation on is from your perspective,  
is the plan that we've drafted here, is this  
still appropriate to carry through with for  
fiscal year '02 and then what we would do is  
if you viewed the Cook Inlet work as being  
important work, then we would -- we would  
want to know from your perspective as we go  
through the '03 process, '03 call for  
proposal, next year's new work, how would  
you view Cook Inlet as opposed to the Copper  
River and those kinds of things. To be  
quite frank, there's also an opportunity  
that, you know, right now, to basically put  
this entire program on hold or just kind of  
pull it back and try to kind of fast-track a  
call for proposals for Cook Inlet for fiscal  
year '02. That's -- that's the discussion  
that we need to have with you and we're  
looking for your recommendation on.

23 I'll throw it open to questions  
24 here and if you need clarification on that,  
25 I'll be happy to respond.

26 MR. LOHSE: Doug, while I can't  
27 speak for the Council, I remember what it



1 was like when we started this program and  
2 tried to fast-track things and it seems to  
3 me like a calculated look at what we want  
4 over the course of a year and solicit for  
5 good, solid proposals would make a lot more  
6 sense than to try to see if we could quickly  
7 throw something together and come up with  
8 something that could be shoved in here in  
9 place of what we've been working on.

10 I don't know if the rest of the  
11 Council feels that way, but I would see that  
12 by next year I would hope, by 200- -- by the  
13 time we're working on the 2003 budget,  
14 recognizing what's going on in Cook Inlet  
15 we'd have some good, solid review proposals  
16 in front of us to address some of the  
17 problems in Cook Inlet. With that, I'll  
18 turn it over to some of my Cook Inlet people  
19 here and see what they say.

20 MR. ELVSASS: I agree with both  
21 versions.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. ELVSASS: No, I have to agree  
24 with what Ralph said. We've got these  
25 programs. We can throw something together  
or, you know, 90-day wonder and then forever  
we'll wonder, and let's do it right. Let's  
get these programs going, let's do them.  
They're very solid programs, they're in the  
mill, and certainly the Cook Inlet issues  
are going to need a lot of data, a lot of  
background, and Cook Inlet wanted -- when it  
really gets going the way I see it, it's  
going to be a very thorny issue. We're  
going to have the views of people like Fred  
Barr and so forth and we need the data to  
back those up. We can't say my friend told  
me this and that, so, with that, I say let's  
keep on track and let's address Cook Inlet  
next year in a timely fashion and also look  
for good proposals for doing the work and  
doing the work to answer the questions  
that's going to be coming up.

26 But I think we better stay on  
27 track. I better let Clare say something.

1 MR. LOHSE: Clare?

2

MS. SWAN: I was just thinking,  
3 oh, my God. Anyway. I agree, Fred. I  
think we've been at all this a long time and  
4 there's no need. I think it would be  
certainly not productive, because that is  
5 going to be -- there will be whining and  
gnashing teeth, so, I think we should  
6 continue with these programs and go on into  
next year and solve the puzzles. It seems  
7 to me they're going to have to start over.

8

MR. LOHSE: Fred or Roy, do you  
9 wish to speak to that at all?

10 MR. EWAN: I don't have any  
comment.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: Does that give you a  
little bit of direction that way, Doug?

13

MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely,  
14 Mr. Chairman. I guess two things. I think  
one of the things we could do -- again, I  
15 pose this as a question. When we do the  
2003 call for proposals -- that will happen  
16 this November -- we could very explicitly  
solicit proposals for Cook Inlet harvest and  
17 use needs, make it quite obvious that that  
strategic priority is floating at the top of  
18 the list for this region -- if that's your  
recommendation, I think that would carry a  
19 tremendous amount of weight.

20 MR. LOHSE: I think that would be  
my recommendation at this point in time. I  
21 don't know -- I'd have to look to the rest  
of the Council on that. But I think if  
22 you -- for one thing, they're going to have  
to identify some of the needs. A lot of  
23 these proposals were put in in response to  
needs -- that's allocation and management  
24 needs that showed up that they were  
addressing specific -- they were addressing  
25 specific needs and this will give them time  
to see what some of those needs are and to

1    come up with projects that would meet -- you  
2    know, meet actual needs and not just  
3    projects that are projects that somebody  
4    thought of as a project. And so, I think to  
5    put a specific call for Cook Inlet projects  
6    for next year would be well advised. And I  
7    mean, that -- would that be the  
8    recommendation of the rest of the Council?

9           MR. ELVSASS: I would say, "Yes."

10          MS. SWAN: Yes.

11          MR. LOHSE: I don't think we need  
12          a formal vote on that. That's a consensus.  
13          And then what you need right now  
14          then is you need whether or not we agree  
15          with your assessment as to will projects  
16          have the priorities whether we agree with  
17          the recommendations of the staff on the  
18          monitoring projects that you've put before  
19          us?

20          MR. MCBRIDE: Exactly.  
21          Do we need a motion on that or a  
22          consensus? Do we need a motion, Ann? What  
23          would you say?

24          MS. WILKINSON: You could do a  
25          motion. That is our formal way. If you  
26          want to do it by consensus, you can do that.

27          MR. LOHSE: Somebody would make a  
28          motion that we have to put some kind of  
29          motion on the table. If somebody will make  
30          a motion that we -- I don't know how you say  
31          it, agree to recommendations that were put  
32          before us on projects, then we can discuss  
33          them and decide whether we want to take them  
34          off or not.

35          MS. SWAN: So moved.

36          MR. LOHSE: It's been so moved.  
37          Do I hear a second?

38          MR. ELVSASS: Yeah.

1           MR. LOHSE: Seconded by Fred.  
2           We have in front of us, then we  
3           have the four projects that he's put before  
4           us, which is the project on the Copper River  
5           with the radio tags and the chinook to find  
6           out timing and where they go, migration  
7           timing and distribution. And that basically  
8           would take care of our stock status  
9           assessment funding that we have in this area  
10          for this year.

11          Does anybody see any of the other  
12          projects as more important that they would  
13          rather replace that with something else out  
14          of the four projects that are in front of us  
15          on that?

16          Any comments from any other  
17          members of the council?  
18          Fred?

19  
20          MR. ELVSASS: Well, you know, you  
21          could say they're more important, less  
22          important. We're restricted by what we can  
23          do, by the amount of funding available, and  
24          we would lose a tremendous amount of money  
25          if we didn't already -- already invested if  
26          we don't continue what we have. So, I say  
27          that we have the fishwheels available, we  
28          need to keep the tagging program going, and  
29          the radio monitoring goes along with it. It  
30          won't happen if you don't do it now.  
31          So, let's do it and make certain  
32          and get it done. I don't have any concept  
33          of how many chinook are in the Copper River.  
34          Hopefully, when this is done we'll know a  
35          lot better about whether or not, maybe I can  
36          go get one.

37  
38          MR. LOHSE: No, you can't. That  
39          information is only available to people who  
40          live in the Copper Basin.

41          MR. ELVSASS: I can move.

42          (Laughter.)

43          MR. LOHSE: Roy?

44          MR. EWAN: Mr. Chairman, I really  
45          agree with Fred. In fact, I do agree with

1 Fred. I think it's a study about species  
that is very important for subsistence. I  
2 think there may be other priorities or  
needs, but I agree with Fred. The -- I'd  
3 like to see the project complete. Just keep  
on going until we get the results you need.  
4

5 MR. LOHSE: Anybody else wish to  
speak to that one?  
6

7 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, I think  
it's really a prudent and productive thing  
8 to do, because we will lose if we don't add  
on to the existing program and just do it  
9 while we can.

10 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
Okay. Fred, do you want to say  
11 anything on it?

12 MR. JOHN: No.

13 MR. LOHSE: Lets go to the TEK  
projects, harvest monitoring TEK projects,  
14 the Copper River Native Project, the Native  
Village of Eyak Project, and the  
15 Chenega/Tatitlek Project, if I remember  
right. And then there's a Chenega/Tatitlek  
16 proposal that part of it was incorporated in  
the other project and part of it was  
17 rejected completely from the staff  
standpoint, right?  
18

19 MR. MCBRIDE: Correct.

20 MR. LOHSE: Now, if we would take  
the one that the staff doesn't recommend,  
that pretty well precludes all of the other  
21 projects right there.

22 So, if anybody wants to make any  
comments on those, we can. Otherwise, we  
can look at them and we can take a vote on  
23 the motion to support the ones that are in  
bold type.  
24

25 MR. LOHSE: This one right here  
(indicating).

1 MR. MCBRIDE: Table 4?

2

MR. LOHSE: Table 4.

3

4 MR. LOHSE: And it's -- it's  
easier just to take this one.

5 MR. MCBRIDE: If you're looking  
at the book, Roy, it's page 15.

6

MR. ELVSASS: You got it?

7

8 MR. EWAN: Okay. I got it. I  
was just looking at that -- Mr. Chairman,  
what confused me, you were mentioning  
9 projects. It doesn't say here which Native  
Corporation or --

10

MR. LOHSE: I got that, I think,  
11 from Doug's presentation that basically says  
077 is going to be done in conjunction with  
12 the Copper River Native Association; 075,  
will be done in conjunction with the Native  
13 Village of Eyak; and 028 will be done -- I  
don't know if it's considered Chenega and  
14 Tatitlek or whether it's considered  
Chugach -- Chugach Region. So, those are  
15 the NGOs that will be working in it.

Then the first one is also by the  
16 Chugach Region, and that was the one that  
portions of it weren't recommended and  
17 portions of it were included in 028. So, to  
me that looks like we get the best bang for  
18 the buck to have the three of them right  
there.

19

MR. ELVSASS: In the bold type?

20

MR. LOHSE: That are in bold  
21 type. Anybody in the rest of the Council  
has got any suggestions on that?

22

Otherwise, we can call for the  
question, and the motion on the table is to  
23 support the recommendations of the 2002  
Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan.

24

25 MS. SWAN: Question.

1 MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
2 called. All in favor, signify by saying  
3 "aye."

4 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

5 MR. LOHSE: Opposed, signify by  
6 saying "nay."

7 Motion carries.

8 And with that, I think we are  
9 going to recess for the day.

10 We'll be starting in the morning  
11 on -- yes, we'll -- we'll be calling for  
12 proposals to change Federal Subsistence  
13 Wildlife Regulations, and then we will go  
14 straight into customary trade. And then  
15 we'll go for the Regional Council Charter,  
16 agency reports, election of officers, other  
17 new business, and we'll adjourn somewhere  
18 around 8:00 o'clock tomorrow night.

19 MR. EWAN: What time are we  
20 starting?

21 MR. LOHSE: 8:30, we'll start in  
22 the morning.

23 Do we need to take our stuff  
24 tonight?

25 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, no,  
you don't need to take your stuff.

MR. LOHSE: Before you leave,  
just in case one of our members isn't here  
at 8:30 in the morning, there's a  
possibility he won't make it until 9:00, I  
was thinking that we might ask for a  
volunteer from one of the agency reports to  
start the day off with. So if there's any  
agency that would like to be the one to  
volunteer to give their report first thing  
in the morning, you'd be done.

MS. SHARP: I would, but I have a  
conflict first thing in the morning.

MR. LOHSE: Anyhow, that's what

1 we're going to try to do. Otherwise, we  
2 don't have anybody who wants to start off  
3 with a report. We probably won't get  
4 started until pretty close to 9:00 o'clock.  
5 We're definitely not going to get on to  
6 customary trade until everybody's here.

7 (Southcentral Subsistence  
8 Regional Advisory Council adjourned at 5:15  
9 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I, Sandra M. Mierop, Certified  
Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that  
the above and foregoing contains a true and  
correct transcription of the Southcentral  
Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory  
Council meeting reported by me on the 2nd  
day of October, 2001.

---

Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

